

APPENDIX A: HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
Summary Findings	2
Population Trends	2
Income and Poverty	2
Employment Trends	2
Special Needs.....	3
Housing Characteristics.....	3
Housing Costs and Affordability	4
Opportunities and Constraints	4
HOUSING NEEDS AND OPPORTUNITIES	5
Population Characteristics	5
Population Trends	5
Ethnicity	6
Age of Population	6
Household Type and Composition	7
Income Characteristics.....	8
Poverty.....	11
Employment Trends.....	12
Area Employment Profile.....	13
Special Needs	15
Elderly	15
Mobility and Self-Care Limitations.....	17
Families with Female Heads of Households	19
Large Families	19
Farmworkers.....	19
Homeless.....	20
Agencies Offering Public Assistance to Homeless and Other Special Needs Groups	20
Housing Characteristics	22
Housing Composition	22
Housing Occupancy	24
Age and Condition of Housing Stock.....	27
Housing Conditions	28
Overcrowding.....	32
Housing Costs	33
Lower Income Households Overpaying	37
Affordability Trends.....	39
Assisted Housing Projects	40
Assisted Rental Housing Eligible for Conversion	40
Future Housing Needs	43
Future Development Potential	44
Areas with Potential for Residential Development	44

CONSTRAINTS	50
Non-Governmental Constraints	50
Land Costs.....	50
Construction and Labor Costs	50
The Cost and Availability of Financing	51
Environmental Constraints	52
Governmental Constraints	52
Land Use Controls.....	52
Permitted Uses in Residential Zoning Districts	54
Building Codes	59
Code Enforcement.....	59
Development Fees	59
Permit Processing Procedures.....	59
Housing for Persons with Disabilities	61
Second Residential Unit Requirements.....	63
Manufactured Homes and Mobile Home Park Standards.....	64
Parking Requirements.....	64
Design Review.....	64
ENERGY CONSERVATION OPPORTUNITIES.....	67
General Design Standards.....	67

LIST OF TABLES

Table A-1	Auburn Population Growth.....	5
Table A-2	Auburn and Placer County Population Growth 2005-2025.....	6
Table A-3	Comparison of Race by City, County, and State Population	6
Table A-4	Age Distribution (2000)	7
Table A-5	Number of Persons per Household (2000).....	7
Table A-6	Household Composition by Type (2000)	8
Table A-7	Median Incomes in Auburn and Placer County (2000).....	9
Table A-8	Household Income (2000).....	9
Table A-9	Definitions Used for Comparing Income Levels.....	10
Table A-10	2000 City of Auburn and Placer County Household Income Range by Income Category.....	10
Table A-11	Placer County Income Limits (2003).....	11
Table A-12	Poverty Thresholds (2000)	11
Table A-13	Auburn 2000 Poverty Rates.....	12
Table A-14	Major Employers in the City of Auburn	13
Table A-15	Occupational Employment (2000) and Wage Data (2001).....	14
Table A-16	Employment Projections as Related to Absolute Job Growth (1997 – 2004).....	15
Table A-17	Pattern of Aging of the Auburn Population	16
Table A-18	State Department of Social Services Licensed Elderly Care Facilities.....	17
Table A-19	Housing Estimates for the City of Auburn (1990 through 2002)	23
Table A-20	Housing Estimates for Placer County (1990 through 2002)	23
Table A-21	Housing Occupancy (2000)	24
Table A-22	Homeownership Rates (2000)	25
Table A-23	Homeownership Rates by Age (2000).....	26
Table A-24	Tenure by Race and Hispanic Origin (2000)	26
Table A-25	Age of Housing Units	27
Table A-26	Housing Condition Survey Results 1-4 Units.....	29
Table A-27	Housing Condition Survey Results 5+ Units.....	30
Table A-28	Housing Conditions Survey – Total Results	31

Table A-29	Persons Per Room in All Occupied Housing Units (2000)	32
Table A-30	Overcrowded Housing (2000).....	33
Table A-31	Rental Rates for Apartments in Auburn and Surrounding Cities (October 2003).....	34
Table A-32	2003 Fair Market Rents for Existing Housing in Placer County.....	34
Table A-33	Resale Home Prices in Auburn (August 2003).....	35
Table A-34	New Home Sale Prices in Auburn	35
Table A-35	Median Home Prices for Auburn and Surrounding Areas (August 2001 and 2002) 36	
Table A-36	Auburn Residential Subdivision Status Listing	36
Table A-37	Number of Households Paying Over 30 Percent of Income on Housing (2000)	38
Table A-38	Auburn Housing Expenditure Rate per Income Group (2000)	38
Table A-39	Affordability of Rental Housing in Relation to Income 2000	39
Table A-40	Sold Units Affordable to Lower-Income Households (2000).....	40
Table A-41	Assisted Rental Units and Section 8 Units	42
Table A-42	Non-Profit Housing Organizations Interested in Acquiring At-Risk Rental Housing.43	
Table A-43	Regional Housing Needs Plan (2000 – 2007)	44
Table A-44	City of Auburn Vacant Land Summary	47
Table A-45	Single-Family Vacant Land – For Sale in Auburn (October 2003)	50
Table A-46	Interest Rates for 15- and 30- Year Fixed Loans	52
Table A-47	City of Auburn Residential Zoning Requirements with Allowable Residential Development.....	56
Table A-48	Residential Permitted, Non-Permitted, and Conditional Use Requirements	57
Table A-49	Application Processing Times.....	58

INTRODUCTION

The Housing Needs Assessment: analyzes population and housing characteristics, identifies special housing needs among certain population groups, evaluates housing conditions, and provides other important information to support the goals, policies, and programs to meet the needs of current and future Auburn residents.

The United States Census, completed every ten years, is an important source of information for the Housing Needs Assessment. Results from the 2000 Census were used in the preparation of this document. The data presented in the Housing Needs Assessment will not only guide the development of housing goals and policies, but will also be integrated into the body of the Housing Element to present the current status of housing and housing related issues in the City of Auburn. Definitions of various U.S. Census terms used throughout this document are provided in Appendix B for clarification.

The needs assessment is organized into four data sections. The first section focuses on demographic information, such as population trends, ethnicity, age, household composition, income, employment, housing characteristics, general housing needs by income, and housing needs for special segments of the population. This first section outlines the characteristics of the community, and identifies those characteristics that may have significant impacts on housing needs in the community.

The second section identifies the City's resources, and the historic development patterns and housing opportunities in the community. It also discusses the City's existing housing stock and the potential areas for future housing development.

The third section discusses the governmental and non-governmental constraints to housing development in Auburn. The City has planning, zoning, and building standards that guide and affect residential development patterns and influence housing availability and affordability. There are also environmental and housing market conditions that affect the location, availability, affordability, and type of housing that is constructed in Auburn. The "non-governmental" influences include such factors as: the availability and cost of financing, land, and materials for building homes; natural conditions that affect the cost of preparing and developing land for housing; and the business decisions of individuals and organizations in home building, finance, real estate, and rental housing that impact housing cost and availability.

The final section of the Needs Assessment discusses opportunities for energy conservation, which can reduce costs to homeowners and infrastructure costs to the City. With a reduction in basic living costs through energy savings, more households will be better able to afford adequate housing.

SUMMARY FINDINGS

The following is a summary of findings from the Housing Needs Assessment Report.

Population Trends

- Between 1990 and 2000 Auburn grew by 18 percent (1,870 persons). Auburn's population is expected to grow steadily over the next 20 years, continuing the demand for a variety of housing types and costs. Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) projects that the City of Auburn will experience a 25 percent growth rate between 2005 and 2020 (3,240 persons).
- Auburn's ethnic composition in 2000 was primarily Non-Hispanic White (90 percent) and Hispanic or Latino (6 percent). Between 1990 and 2000 the percentage of Non-Hispanic Whites decreased by 3 percent, while the percentage of Hispanics or Latinos increased by 2 percent.
- The City of Auburn has a slightly lower percentage of persons under 18 and a slightly higher percentage of persons 65 years and over than the countywide and statewide averages. Family households represented 62 percent of all households in Auburn in 2000, compared to 73 percent countywide. Of the 3,284 family households in the City, the majority did not have children (1,780 family households or 54 percent of the total family households).

Income and Poverty

- Residents of Auburn and Placer County have similar income characteristics. In 2000, the median family income in Auburn (\$62,250) was roughly 94 percent of the countywide median family income (\$65,858). One-half of the total households countywide earn \$50,000 or more compared to 58 percent of the total households in Auburn.
- As defined by the Department of Housing and Urban Development's (HUD) income limits, a very low-income household earns 50 percent or less than the county median income, a low-income household earns between 51 and 80 percent of the county median income, a moderate-income household earns between 81 and 120 percent of the county median income, and an above moderate-income household earns 121 percent or greater of the county median income. Based on Placer County's median income of \$57,535 (2000 Census), approximately 28 percent of Auburn's households are very low-income, 17 percent are low-income, 27 percent are moderate-income, and 28 percent are above moderate-income.
- The poverty rate for both Auburn and Placer County was 6 percent in 2000. Although Hispanics and female-headed households with children represent a small percentage of the total population in Auburn, they had the highest poverty rates at 19 percent and 18 percent, respectively. Residents 65 years of age or older had relatively lower poverty rates at 6 percent.

Employment Trends

- The top five major employers in Auburn are Coherent (manufacturing – 620 employees), Mountain Peoples Warehouse (manufacturing – 350 employees), Pacific Gas and Electric Company (Gas Company – 350 employees), Nella Oil Company (oil company – 350 employees) and Placer Sierra Bank, 30 branches (bank – 315 employees).

- The Employment Development Department (EDD) releases employment projections as related to absolute job growth for the period 1997 – 2004. Auburn is included in the Golden Sierra Consortium, which includes Placer, Alpine, El Dorado, Nevada, and Sierra counties. New employment for the Golden Sierra Consortium is forecasted to be concentrated in professional, computer support and electronic engineers, carpenters, and teacher's aides. Many of these jobs will pay wages or salaries in the low- to moderate-income level for single-wage earner households. This employment growth will contribute to a continuing need for additional affordable housing for such income groups.

Special Needs

- As the current population ages, Auburn will experience an increase in the number of older adults with special housing needs over the next 20 years. Persons age 65 and over represent 18 percent of Auburn's total population, and experienced a 6 percent increase (122 persons) in population between 1990 and 2000. The housing needs among older adults in Auburn are: 1) financial support for low-income seniors who do not own their homes, 2) financial assistance for home maintenance and repairs among low-income senior homeowners, 3) assisted care living facilities for those who have self-care and mobility limitations, 4) affordable independent living rental housing, and 5) financial assistance for home modifications for those with minor self-care or mobility concerns.
- Non-elderly individuals with disabilities also have financial and physical needs. Although the number of such individuals represents a small percentage of all residents, their needs frequently remain unmet by the private market.
- Female-headed households represent 10 percent of all households in Auburn, and of these households 339, or 6 percent, were female-headed households with children under age 18. Poverty rates among female-headed households are generally higher than the general population, and female-headed households with children under age 18 in Auburn have the second highest poverty rate of any population group (18 percent). Many female-headed householders have extremely low incomes and they will continue to require significant financial assistance or subsidized rental housing. Single mothers with children face additional challenges in finding affordable family housing of suitable size.
- Large family households in Auburn represent approximately 6 percent (340 households) of all households. One-third of these large family households are renters and have the greatest unmet housing needs due to high rates of overcrowding and overpayment.
- Based on available information and contacts with service providers, the level of, and need for, homelessness services in the City is increasing on a region-wide basis.

Housing Characteristics

- The majority of the City's housing stock consists of single-family detached homes (67 percent). According to the 2000 Census, the percentage of homeowners among Auburn households (60 percent) falls below that of households countywide (73 percent).
- Homeownership in the City is highest among persons age 55 to 64 at 79 percent. In 2000, persons of Hispanic origin comprised 6 percent of the population and represented 3 percent of homeowners.
- Most of Auburn's housing stock—just over 60 percent—is greater than 30 years old. For example, in 2000, 44 percent of Auburn's total housing stock was built prior to 1970. Less than 20 percent of the City's housing was constructed since the 1990s. According to the City

of Auburn, between 1999 and June 2003, 278 building permits were approved by the City, or on average, roughly 55 building permits per year.

- According to the 2003 Housing Conditions Survey, 30 percent of the housing stock in Auburn is considered substandard and in need of rehabilitation, while less than one percent is in need of replacement.
- Of the City's occupied housing units approximately 3 percent were overcrowded, compared to 4 percent countywide. Overcrowding occurred more often in rental housing (6 percent) than owner-occupied housing (1 percent).

Housing Costs and Affordability

- In 2000, 68 percent of all rental housing in Auburn was affordable to very low-income households, and 97 percent was affordable to low-income households. However, the existence of lower-cost units does not mean that such units are actually available to lower-income households. Currently, eight apartment complexes in the City have some type of rental subsidy. Of the approximate 5,440 housing units citywide, this equates to roughly 9 percent or 472 units having rent restrictions affordable to very low- and low-income households.
- The majority of rental units in Auburn are one-and two-bedroom units.
- Approximately 78 percent of very low-income households and 40 percent of low-income households spend over 30 percent of their income on housing in Auburn.
- Between January and September 2003, the median price for resale homes in Auburn was \$336,500. New home sale prices in Auburn are starting in the mid- to high- \$300,000s.
- Based on the total resale homes in 2000, 1 percent of the homes were affordable to very low-income households, while 7 percent were affordable to low-income households. Generally, only households with incomes above the countywide median can afford to purchase a new home in Auburn.

Opportunities and Constraints

- SACOG has determined that Auburn has a housing construction need of 688 units for the planning period 2000-2007. Of the total 688 units, 13 percent should be affordable to very low-income households, 17 percent to low-income households, 30 percent to moderate-income households, and 40 percent to above moderate-income households. Very low- and low-income housing needs represent 215 housing units of the City's total housing allocation.
- The City's vacant land within residential districts can accommodate its regional allocation of new dwelling units at densities potentially affordable to low- or very low-income households.
- Auburn's zoning regulations and development permit processes do not create unreasonable restrictions to the City's ability to accommodate affordable housing. The time required in the City of Auburn for development approval is not generally a constraint or substantial cost to housing developers.

HOUSING NEEDS AND OPPORTUNITIES

POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS

Population Trends

Between 1990 and 2000 Auburn experienced an 18 percent rate of growth, which was significantly lower than Placer County's growth rate of 44 percent (Table A-1). Much of the population growth experienced by Auburn during the past ten years is a result of the attractiveness of a small town atmosphere.

Table A-1

Auburn Population Growth

	1990	2000	Percent Change
City	10,592	12,462	18%
County	172,796	248,399	44%

Source: 1990 and 2000 Census.

Table A-2 includes the SAGOG projections for the City and County through 2025. For the City of Auburn, SACOG has projected a 13 percent growth rate between 2000 and 2010 and a 16 percent increase between 2010 and 2025. In Placer County, SACOG has projected a 35 percent growth rate increase between 2000 and 2010 and a 23 percent growth rate increase between 2010 and 2025. According to SACOG projections, the City of Auburn is expected to reach a population of over 17,350 by 2025.

Between 1990 and 2000, the number of households in Auburn increased from 4,761 to 5,486 (15 percent). SACOG projects a somewhat dramatic increase in the number of households by 2025 (7,998 households or a 46 percent increase).

Between 2000 and 2010, the number of persons per household is projected to increase slightly in Auburn from 2.23 to 2.24. The number of persons per household in Placer County is also projected to increase slightly from 2.68 to 2.69.

Through 2020, the average household size in Auburn is projected to remain the same, but then increase slightly to 2.25 by 2025. In contrast, SACOG projects that Placer County will experience an increase in the average household size, from 2.63 in 2000 to 2.70 in 2025.

Table A-2**Auburn and Placer County Population Growth 2005-2025**

	2005	2010	2020	2025
Population				
Auburn	13,000	14,090	16,240	17,350
Placer County	292,640	336,805	396,785	415,335
Households				
Auburn	5,713	6,183	7,127	7,600
Placer County	75,155	87,234	100,785	104,124
Persons per Household				
Auburn	2.24	2.24	2.24	2.25
Placer County	2.69	2.69	2.69	2.70

Source: SACOG Projections 2001.

Ethnicity

An analysis of Auburn's population between 1990 and 2000 shows the percentage of Non-Hispanic Whites decreased by 3 percent, while the percentage of Hispanics or Latinos increased by 2 percent (Table A-3). All other racial and ethnic groups remained a small part of the City's population. Comparably in 2000, Placer County had a smaller percentage of Non-Hispanic Whites (83 percent) than Auburn (90 percent), and a slightly higher percentage of Hispanic or Latino's (10 percent) than Auburn (6 percent).

Table A-3**Comparison of Race by City, County, and State Population**

Race	Auburn 1990	Auburn 2000	Placer County 2000	California 2000
Non-Hispanic White	93%	90%	83%	47%
Black	<1%	<1%	<1%	6%
Native American	1%	1%	<1%	1%
Asian/Pacific Islander	1%	1%	3%	11%
Other Race	<1%	0%	<1%	<1%
Two or More Races ¹	--	2%	2%	3%
Hispanic or Latino	4%	6%	10%	32%

Source: 1990 and 2000 Census.

¹This is a 2000 Census category only.**Age of Population**

A comparison of the ages among the City, County, and State populations shows general similarities (Table A-4). Overall, the City of Auburn has an older population, with a median age of 41 compared

to 38 for all of Placer County and 33 for all of California. Individuals over 54 years of age comprised 27 percent of the City's population in 2000, compared to roughly 22 percent county and 19 percent statewide. Conversely, 25 percent of Auburn's residents were under age 20 in 2000, compared to 29 percent countywide. The larger percentage of mature adults in Auburn is consistent with the lower percentage of families with children (see Table A-6, page A-8).

Table A-4

Age Distribution (2000)

Age	Auburn 2000	Placer County 2000	California 2000
Under 5 years	5%	7%	7%
5 to 19 years	20%	22%	23%
20 to 34 years	16%	16%	22%
35 to 54 years	32%	33%	29%
55 to 64 years	9%	9%	8%
65 and over	18%	13%	11%
Median age	41	38	33

Source: 2000 Census.

Household Type and Composition

Further insight into the characteristics of the City's population is explored by examining household size. Compared to Placer County, the number of persons per household in Auburn is greater overall, as the City had a higher percentage of households with four to six persons (26 percent) than the County (18 percent). Of the 5,302 households in 2000, Table A-5 shows that Auburn's highest percentage consisted of one-and two-person households (21 and 36 percent respectively). The next largest percentage was three-person households (17 percent). The highest percentage of households in Placer County consisted of two-person households (36 percent) followed by one-person households (31 percent).

Table A-5

Number of Persons per Household (2000)

	Auburn 2000	Placer County 2000
1 Person	21%	31%
2 Persons	36%	36%
3 Persons	17%	14%
4 Persons	16%	12%
5 Persons	7%	4%
6 Persons	2%	1%
7+ Persons	1%	1%

Source: 2000 Census.

In addition to household size, household composition provides important indicators of population characteristics and trends (Table A-6). The 2000 Census reported that 62 percent of all households in Auburn were family households and, of that, 78 percent were married-couple households. Compared to the countywide population, Auburn has a slightly lower percentage of family households and families with children. Although most people lived in family households, 38 percent of households in Auburn were non-family households, primarily single adults (including seniors), but also other unrelated individuals. By comparison, the 2000 Census reported that 73 percent of all households in Placer County were family households, and of these households, an overwhelming 82 percent were married-couple households.

The 2000 Census records persons living within group quarters separately and considers them to be non-family households. The City of Auburn had a reported 206 persons living within group quarters, of which 94 persons were institutionalized and 112 persons were living in other group quarters.

Table A-6

Household Composition by Type (2000)

Household Type	Number of Households		Percent of Households	
	City	County	City	County
Total Households	5,302	93,382	--	--
Family Households	3,284	67,742	62%	73%
Married Couple Family Households	2,573	55,494	78%	82%
With Children	1,052	25,392	32%	37%
Without Children	1,521	30,102	46%	44%
Other Family Households	711	12,248	22%	18%
With Children	452	7,541	14%	11%
Without Children	259	4,707	8%	7%
Non-family Households	2,018	25,640	38%	27%
Living Alone	1,681	19,860	32%	77%
Households with individuals under 18 years	1,605	35,225	30%	38%
Households with individuals 65 years and over	1,578	22,133	30%	24%
Group Quarters (Non-Family Households)				
Institutionalized persons	94	1,819	46%	63%
Other persons in group quarters	112	1,069	54%	37%
Total	206	2,888	100%	100%

Source: 2000 Census.

INCOME CHARACTERISTICS

According to the 2000 Census, the median household income in the City of Auburn was \$48,999, while the median family income was \$62,250 (Table A-7). In comparison, the median household income in Placer County was \$57,535 and the median family income was \$65,858. This indicates that incomes in Auburn were roughly 80 to 90 percent of the countywide income. In 2000, 21 percent of Auburn households had incomes above \$100,000, compared to 16 percent countywide.

Table A-7

Median Incomes in Auburn and Placer County (2000)

	Auburn	Placer County	Auburn as a Percent of County
Median Household Income	\$48,999	\$57,535	85%
Median Family Income	\$62,250	\$65,858	94%
Median Non-Family Income	\$29,245	\$32,766	89%

Source: 2000 Census.

Table A-8 shows the distribution of incomes in 2000 for the City of Auburn and Placer County. Approximately 57 percent of the households in the County were earning incomes over \$50,000, compared to 49 percent of households in Auburn.

Table A-8

Household Income (2000)

Income	2000 Percent of Total Households in Auburn	2000 Percent of Total Households in Placer County
Under \$14,999	13%	9%
\$15,000 to \$24,999	9%	9%
\$25,000 to \$34,999	13%	10%
\$35,000 to \$49,999	16%	15%
\$50,000 to \$74,999	21%	22%
\$75,000 – \$99,999	13%	15%
\$100,000 – \$149,999	10%	13%
\$150,000 - \$199,999	3%	4%
\$200,000 or more	2%	3%

Source: 2000 Census.

Four income categories are typically used for comparative purposes that are based on a percentage of the county median income and adjusted for household size. These categories are referred to as “very low-income,” “low-income,” “moderate-income,” and “above moderate-income.”

The median income, on which these four categories are based, represents the mid-point at which half of the households earn more and half earn less. In a normally distributed population (that is, one not skewed to either end of the income scale), approximately 40 percent of the population will have income within the very low- and low-income ranges, about 20 percent will be within the moderate-income range, and about 40 percent will be in the above moderate-income range.

The standard definition of income categories used by HUD are as follows: households earning 50 percent of the median household income or less are classified as very low-income; households earning 51-80 percent of the median household income are classified as low-income; households earning 81-120 percent of the median household income are moderate-income; and households earning greater than 120 percent of the median household income are above moderate (Table A-9).

Table A-9

Definitions Used for Comparing Income Levels

Income Definitions	
Very Low-Income	50 percent or less of the Placer County Median Income
Low-Income	51 to 80 percent of the Placer County Median Income
Moderate-Income	81 to 120 percent of the Placer County Median Income
Above Moderate-Income	121 percent or greater of the Placer County Median Income

Source: HUD Income Limits, 2003.

Table A-10 provides the percentages of Placer County and Auburn residents that are within these income ranges. Placer County is closer to a normally distributed population than Auburn because of its much larger population—about 43 percent of the population countywide is within the very low- and low-income ranges, 25 percent within the moderate-income range, and 35 percent in the above moderate-income range. Auburn's population is weighted toward the lower end of the income scale, with the very low- and low-income populations comprising 51 percent of all households and an above-moderate income population comprising only 28 percent of all households.

Table A-10

**2000 City of Auburn and Placer County
Household Income Range by Income Category**

Income Category	2000 Income Range	Auburn Percent of Households in 2000 (approximately)	Placer County Percent of Households in 2000 (approximately)
Very Low Income	\$0 - \$28,768	22%	18%
Low Income	\$28,769 - \$46,028	29%	25%
Moderate Income	\$46,029 - \$69,042	21%	22%
Above Moderate Income	\$69,043 and over	28%	35%
1990 Auburn City Median Income: \$32,708 ¹		2000 Placer County Median Income: \$57,535 ²	
2000 Auburn City Median Income: \$48,999 ²		2003 Placer County Median Income: \$59,800 ³	

Source: 1990 and 2000 Census and 2003 HUD Income Limits.

¹1990 Census Median Income.

²2000 Census Median Income.

³2003 HUD Income Limits.

Another measure of changes in estimated income is the annual release of income limits prepared by HUD and adopted by the State of California for determining eligibility for various housing programs. These limits define the dollar amount of each of the four income levels discussed previously (very low, low, moderate, and above moderate) based on a percentage of the estimated median income for the county in which the jurisdiction is located. Although these income limits are not based on actual surveys of local incomes, the annual changes can show trends in estimated changes among different regions of the State. Table A-11 provides limits for Placer County for 2003. According to HUD, the estimated 2003 median income for a family of four in Placer County is \$57,535.

Table A-11**Placer County Income Limits (2003)**

Household Size	Very Low-Income (50% of Median)	Low-Income (80% of Median)
1 Person	\$20,000	\$32,000
2 Persons	\$22,850	\$36,550
3 Persons	\$25,700	\$41,100
4 Persons	\$28,550	\$45,700
5 Persons	\$30,850	\$49,350
6 Persons	\$33,100	\$53,000
7 Persons	\$35,400	\$56,650
8 Persons	\$37,700	\$60,300

Source: HUD, 2003.

Poverty

The poverty level of income is a federally defined measure of the minimum income needed for subsistence living. The poverty level is an important indicator of severe financial distress, and the rate of poverty in a community (proportion of the population with poverty level incomes or less) provides important information about individuals and families in greatest financial need. The dollar threshold for poverty is adjusted each year by the federal government for household size and composition. Table A-12 provides year 2000 poverty thresholds for several types of households.

Table A-12**Poverty Thresholds (2000)**

Single Person 65+	\$8,259	Two Adults, One Child	\$13,861
Single Person Under 65	\$8,959	One Adult, Three Children	\$17,524
Two Persons 65+	\$10,409	Two Adults, Two Children	\$17,463
Two Persons Under 65	\$11,531	One Adult, Four Children	\$20,236
One Adult, Two Children	\$13,874	Two Adults, Three Children	\$20,550

Source: 2000 Census.

According to the 2000 Census, approximately 6 percent of the City and County populations were below the poverty level (Table A-13). Of individuals in households with income below the poverty level, persons age 65 and over had a poverty rate of 6 percent, under age 65, 7 percent, age 18 and under, 7 percent, and female-headed households with children (primarily mothers with no spouse present), 18 percent. In most communities, seniors typically have below-average rates of poverty compared to the population as a whole, and female-headed households with children typically have the highest rate of poverty. Other groups with significantly higher poverty rates include individuals of Hispanic origin and Native Americans (who comprise a very small percentage of the total population in Auburn).

Table A-13

Auburn 2000 Poverty Rates

Group	Above Poverty Level		Below Poverty Level		Poverty Rate	
	Auburn	Placer County	Auburn	Placer County	Auburn	Placer County
65 and Over	2,147	29,976	139	1,200	6%	4%
Under 65	9,348	201,432	692	13,072	7%	6%
Under 18	2,467	60,363	190	4,317	7%	7%
18-64	6,881	141,069	502	8,755	7%	6%
Female Headed Households with Children	277	4,125	62	1,208	18%	23%
Married Couple Families	1,437	65,624	67	2,118	4%	6%
Black	33	1,667	0	217	0%	12%
Asian/Pacific Islander	183	7,209	7	368	4%	5%
Hispanic	608	20,602	141	3,001	19%	13%
Native American	53	1,585	0	115	0%	7%
White	10,324	194,472	648	10,233	6%	5%
Other	162	6,740	31	1,310	16%	16%
Two or More Races	305	7,849	35	631	10%	7%
Total Population¹	11,495	231,405	831	14,272	6%	6%

Source: 2000 Census.

¹Total population is the household population only, excludes residents living in group quarters.

EMPLOYMENT TRENDS

Most of the employment in Auburn is related to either manufacturing or retail industries. Many Auburn residents who have managerial and professional jobs commute to Roseville or Sacramento for work. According to the 2000 Census, the City of Auburn had 6,067 persons age 16 years and older in the labor force. Of the total labor force population, approximately 36 percent were employed as management, professional, while another 28 percent were employed in technical, sales, and administrative support occupations. Other common occupations were service occupations (17 percent) and precision production, craft and repair occupations (8 percent).

Table A-14 lists major employers throughout the City of Auburn. Most of the top employers are manufacturers, retail/service establishments, or distribution companies.

Table A-14**Major Employers in the City of Auburn**

Company	Product/Service	Employees
Coherent	Optic and Laser Systems	620
Mountain Peoples Warehouse	Manufacturing	300
Pacific Gas & Electric Co.	Gas Company	350
Nella Oil Company	Oil Company	350
Placer Sierra Bank (30 Branches)	Bank	315
Pacific Bell Telephone	Phone Company	160
Pride Industries	Manufacturing	150
Carpenter Advanced Ceramics	Manufacturing	120
Auburn Journal	Newspaper	115
Placer County Offices	County	113
Albertson's Market	Service	110
Long's Drug Stores	Service	110
City of Auburn	Government	100
U.S. Post Office	Post Office	100
Auburn-Placer Disposal	Disposal Company	86
Auburn Recreation District	Service	52
Gottschalk's Department Store	Service	40
SOE Trading & Management	Service	35
Bank Of America	Bank	33
Aspect Electronics	Service	28

Source: City of Auburn, Chamber of Commerce, 2003.

Area Employment Profile

The EDD produces an Occupational Employment and Wage Data spreadsheet by metropolitan statistical area (MSA) yearly. For the year 2000 a sample of jobs and salaries was taken relating to projected job growth in the City of Auburn. Table A-15 lists the mean annual wage, and the 25th and 75th percentile annual wage of the working force for each job category. Occupations listed are in the areas of retail sales, service, technical fields, laborers, and general office personnel. Roughly one-half of the occupations listed have mean annual wages in the very low- and low-income ranges as defined in Table A-10 (page A-10) by the 2001 Placer County median income.

Table A-15

Occupational Employment (2000) and Wage Data (2001)¹

Occupational Title	Employment Estimates	Mean Annual Wage	25 th Percentile Annual Wage	75 th Percentile Annual Wage
General and Operations Managers	11,380	\$81,823	\$52,541	\$108,264
Computer Programmers	2,380	\$66,429	\$50,939	\$81,744
Computer Software Engineers	2,170	\$77,537	\$62,441	\$90,230
Computer Support Specialists	2,330	\$43,021	\$31,491	\$51,272
Electrical and Electronic Engineers	1,370	\$41,930	\$33,155	\$49,816
Elementary School Teachers, Except Special Education	7,770	\$48,535	N/A ²	N/A ²
Middle School Teachers, Except Special Education	3,120	\$49,756	N/A ²	N/A ²
Secondary School Teachers, Except Special Education	2,990	\$52,005	N/A ²	N/A ²
Registered Nurses	9,410	\$59,570	\$50,918	\$68,827
Groundskeeping Workers	40	\$28,300	\$14,040 ³	\$41,392 ³
Waiters and Waitresses	9,900	\$16,836	\$14,040 ³	\$15,267 ³
Cashiers	19,180	\$20,761	\$14,768	\$23,088
Retail Salespersons	21,940	\$21,808	\$14,851	\$22,838
Receptionists and Information Clerks	7,370	\$24,344	\$19,344	\$28,746
Customer Service Representative	13,130	\$30,754	\$23,920	\$37,066
Carpenters	9,300	\$42,789	\$32,261	\$53,976

Source: EDD, 2000.

¹Sacramento County Metropolitan Statistical Area; includes El Dorado, Placer, and Sacramento counties

²An estimate of employment could not be provided.

³The survey reference date was in the fourth quarter of 2001, when the California minimum wage was \$6.25 per hour. Since these wages were updated to 2002, and the minimum wage changed to \$6.75 per hour on January 1, 2002, wages below \$6.75 were set to \$6.75 per hour.

Table A-16 shows employment projections from 1999 to 2006, as related to job growth for the area the Golden Sierra Consortium oversees, which includes Placer, Alpine, El Dorado, Nevada, and Sierra counties. The Golden Sierra Consortium is an agency that coordinates employment and training programs for displaced workers and the economically disadvantaged. The occupations listed in Table A-16 have the greatest absolute job growth potential, as determined by EDD. Over the next five years, the City of Auburn expects new employment to be concentrated in retail and service industries, light manufacturing, distribution, and technology related fields. Many of these jobs will pay wages in the low- and moderate-income ranges as defined in Table A-10 (page A-11) by the 2003 Placer County median income.

Table A-16

Employment Projections as Related to Absolute Job Growth (1997 – 2004)¹

Occupation	Annual Averages		Absolute Change (Number of Jobs)	Percent Change
	1999	2006		
Retail Salesperson	5,450	7,870	2,420	44.4%
Cashiers	5,340	7,330	1,990	37.3%
Carpenters	3,230	5,060	1,830	56.7%
General Office Clerks	4,130	5,940	1,810	43.8%
General Managers, Top Executives	4,170	5,950	1,780	42.7%
Computer Support Specialists	810	2,120	1,310	161.7%
Teachers Aides, Professional	2,120	3,240	1,120	52.8%
Waiters and Waitresses	3,920	4,970	1,050	26.8%
Systems Analysts – Electronic Data Processing	740	1,730	990	133.8%
General Secretaries	2,950	3,910	960	32.5%
Laborers, Landscaping	2,270	3,220	950	41.9%
Registered Nurses	2,020	2,880	860	42.6%
Janitors, Cleaners	2,400	3,250	850	35.4%
Bookkeeping, Accounting Clerks	2,690	3,430	740	27.5%
Computer Programmers	890	1,600	710	79.8%
Receptionists, Information Clerks	1,710	2,420	710	41.5%
Computer Engineers	470	1,110	640	136.2%
Sales Representatives	1,280	1,790	510	39.8%
Electrical and Electronic Engineers	740	1,190	450	60.8%

Source: EDD, 2000.

¹Golden Sierra Consortium; includes Placer, Alpine, El Dorado, Nevada, and Sierra counties.

SPECIAL NEEDS

Housing needs are a reflection of the special characteristics of the residents. The elderly, persons with disabilities, female heads of households, large families, farmworkers, and the homeless are examples of those who may have particular difficulty locating housing that meets their special needs.

Elderly

Persons over the age of 65 face special housing challenges related to physical and financial conditions. Older adults often face declining mobility and self-care capabilities that create special housing needs and challenges for them. Many older adults, even those owning their own homes, face financial challenges due to limited incomes from Social Security and other retirement benefits. Data

on the incomes and housing expenses of householders age 65 and older indicate that a substantial number (although by no means the majority) of these older adults may need assistance related to:

- repair and maintenance of owned dwellings units;
- modifications to existing homes to better meet mobility and self-care limitations;
- financial assistance to meet rising rental housing costs for those who do not own; and
- supportive services to meet daily needs, such as those provided at assisted care residences.

Table A-17 compares the number of older adults in 1990 to 2000. Over the past decade, the population age 65 and over in the City of Auburn has increased by 122 individuals, while the population 55 years of age or more has increased by 306 individuals. In 2000, the population represented by persons 55 years of age or more was 27 percent of the total population, while persons 65 years of age or more represented 18 percent. Between 1990 and 2000, Auburn experienced a 10 percent increase in the population 55 years of age or more, and a 6 percent increase in the population 65 years of age or more. As the total number of older adults in Auburn continues to increase, it can be determined that the housing needs of seniors will continue to be a significant aspect of total housing needs in the City.

Table A-17

Pattern of Aging of the Auburn Population

	1990	2000	Percent Change
Total Population	10,592	12,462	18%
Population 55+	3,092	3,398	10%
Population 65+	2,139	2,261	6%

Source: 1990 and 2000 Census.

In 2000, the incidence of poverty among the population in Auburn over 65 years of age was slightly less than for persons age 18 to 64 at 6 and 7 percent, respectively. The countywide poverty rate among persons age 65 and over was less than Auburn's (4 percent). These percentages show that, as a group, persons age 65 and over in Auburn are to some extent not as affected by poverty as the population aged 18 to 64. However, it is not unusual for seniors to have higher poverty rates. Even with Social Security and other retirement benefits that provide a guaranteed minimum income, a large percentage may be low-income.

Tenure is also important when analyzing the needs of seniors. Older adults typically have the highest rates of homeownership of any age group, and Auburn's senior homeowner population is no exception. In Auburn, the proportion of seniors living in owner-occupied housing was 65 percent in 2000, compared to 60 percent for the total population (see Table A-23, page A-26). Although seniors represent about 18 percent of the population, they comprise 31 percent of all homeowners.

Many households in Auburn have occupied the same unit for more than 30 years. In 2000, 6 percent of the total occupied housing units were occupied by the same householder that lived in the unit prior to 1969, and of these units, 8 were renter-occupied households. Substantial proportions of owner-occupied housing units in Auburn carry no mortgage (822 units or 28 percent). Although there is no direct data available, it seems reasonable to conclude that many of the elderly residents in Auburn have occupied their homes for many years and have long since paid off their mortgage. This suggests

the potential use of a reverse annuity program for some elderly residents having difficulty meeting other rising costs of living.

The large number of elderly individuals living alone also suggests that there may be some opportunity to make more effective use of the existing housing stock, as well as provide companionship for the elderly, by matching those in need of housing with those who have excess space in large houses. A program of moderate rehabilitation could compliment such a matching program by providing more habitable space in older deteriorating units.

One common special need for a growing portion of the population age 65 and over is for assisted living facilities that combine meal, medical, and daily living assistance in a residential environment. There are nine State Department of Social Services licensed care facility were identified as providing services in Auburn to residents age 65 and over (Table A-18).

Table A-18

State Department of Social Services Licensed Elderly Care Facilities

Name	Address	License Status	Number of Beds
Auburn Ravine Terrace	750 Auburn Ravine Road	Licensed	39
Beth Shalom	182 Valley View Drive	Licensed	6
Pinecrest Retirement Home	107 Pinecrest Avenue	Licensed	6
Pleasantdale Care Home	188 College Way	Licensed	15
Rothchild Home	189 College Way	Licensed	6
Skyridge Estate	201 N. McDaniel Drive	Licensed	6
Village Lane Residence	155 Village Lane	Licensed	6
Westwood Hills Senior Care Homes	521 Silkwood Drive	Licensed	6

Source: State of California Care Network, 2003.

Mobility and Self-Care Limitations

Less than 20 percent of the City's non-institutionalized residents have physical conditions that affect their abilities to live independently in conventional residential settings according to the Census Bureau. These individuals have mobility impairments, self-care limitations, or other conditions that may require special housing accommodations or financial assistance.

Such individuals can have a number of special needs that distinguish them from the population at large.

- Individuals with mobility difficulties (such as people who are wheelchair users) may require special accommodations or modifications to their homes to allow for continued independent living. Such modifications are often called “handicapped access.”
- Individuals with self-care limitations (which can include persons with mobility difficulties) may require residential environments that include in-home or on-site support services, ranging from congregate to convalescent care. Support services can include medical therapy, daily living assistance, congregate dining, and related services.
- Individuals with developmental disabilities and other physical and mental conditions that prevent them from functioning independently may require assisted care or group home environments.
- Individuals with disabilities may require financial assistance to meet their housing needs because typically a higher percentage are low-income than the population at large and their special housing needs are often more costly than conventional housing.

Some people with mobility and/or self-care limitations are able to live with their families, who can assist in meeting housing and daily living needs. A segment of the disabled population, particularly low-income and retired individuals, may not have the financial capacity to pay for needed accommodations or modifications to their homes. Even those able to pay for special housing accommodations may find them unavailable in the City.

Disabled persons often require special housing features to accommodate physical limitations. Some disabled persons may experience financial difficulty in locating suitable housing due to the cost of modifications to meet their daily living needs, or may have difficulty in finding appropriate housing near places of employment. Although the California Administrative Code (Title 24) requires that all public buildings be accessible to the public through architectural standards such as ramps, large doors, and restroom modifications to enable handicap access, not all available housing units have these features. There are also other types of physical and design modifications that may be necessary to accommodate various types of disabilities.

Information on handicapped individuals is generally sketchy at best. This is due in part to the fact that a disability can take many forms that may or may not be pertinent to an analysis of housing needs. According to 2000 Census data, there were approximately 2,486 non-institutionalized persons over age 5 in Auburn with mobility and/or self-care limitations. It is difficult to determine how many of these cases may directly pose special needs in housing. Special needs relate primarily to access and safety considerations, but given the limited income potential for many disabled persons, housing affordability is also a concern.

As a result of the 1988 Federal Fair Housing Law, newly constructed multi-family units are to be built to accommodate the disabled population of the community. Some apartments and condominiums are now required to be equipped with special features such as ramps, oversized halls, entryways and bathrooms to increase accessibility for disabled persons. The American Disabilities Act requires physically disabled access in all public buildings, including residential complexes. The City's Building Department reviews building plans for compliance with these and similar statutes. With the implementation of accessibility laws, the housing needs of this group are largely financial.

Through its implementation of the housing policies and programs outlined in this element, the City will seek to provide affordable housing to this special needs group.

Families with Female Heads of Households

Most female-headed households are either single-women over the age of 65, or single-women (mothers or other female relatives) with minor children. Traditionally, these groups have been considered special needs groups because their incomes tend to be lower, making it difficult to obtain affordable housing, or because they have specific physical needs related to housing (such as child care or assisted living support for older adults). Single mothers in particular tend to have difficulty in obtaining suitable affordable housing. Such households also have a greater need for housing with convenient access to child-care facilities, public transportation, and other public facilities and services.

Of the 5,302 households in the City in 2000, 531 were female-headed households, or 10 percent of the total households in Auburn. Of these households 339, or 6 percent, were female-headed households with minor children. Seventy (14 percent) of these female-headed households were classified as living below the poverty level. It may be assumed that most of these households are overpaying for housing (i.e. more than 30 percent of their income), or are experiencing other unmet housing needs. As a result of poverty, female heads of households often spend more on immediate needs such as food, clothing, transportation, and medical care than on home maintenance, which results in living units falling into disrepair.

Large Families

Large families (defined by HUD as family households with five or more persons) can have difficulty securing adequate housing due to the need for a larger number of bedrooms (three or more) to avoid overcrowding. Overcrowding is defined by the U.S. Census as having more than one person per room, excluding uninhabitable spaces such as bathrooms, hallways, and closets. The 2000 Census indicates that conventional single-family dwellings were the primary housing type in Auburn. The average number of rooms per unit was 5.4, while the average number of persons per unit was 2.31.

Low-income large families typically need financial assistance in Placer County to secure affordable housing that meets their space needs. It becomes even more difficult when large families try to find adequate rentals within their budget, because rentals typically have fewer bedrooms than ownership housing. As a result, large families tend to have higher rates of overcrowding and overpaying for housing (housing costs that exceed 30 percent of a household's income). Many large families are composed of immigrants and/or minorities who may face additional housing challenges due to discrimination and/or limited language proficiency. In the City of Auburn, there were 340 households of five or more persons in 2000, about 6 percent of all households, slightly lower than the proportion of large family households countywide (10 percent). Of the total large family households, roughly two-thirds were owner-occupied households, while one-third were renter-occupied households. It is likely that the large family renter households have the greatest needs related to housing availability and affordability.

Farmworkers

Farmworkers tend to have low incomes due to the lower-paying nature of their work. Farmworkers who are permanent residents, particularly those who are part of large family households, face many of the same difficulties in obtaining suitable affordable housing as other low-income families.

Therefore, finding sound, affordable housing of sufficient size to accommodate their families is a high priority need among farmworkers.

The Auburn area does not support agricultural production that requires a seasonal labor force. The 2000 Census reported less than 1 percent (39 employed persons 16 years and older) of workers in the City of Auburn were engaged in the occupations of farming, forestry, and fishing. Because there is no manual labor crop harvested in east Placer County and Auburn areas that utilizes migrant workers, the City has no plans for providing labor camps to house migrant farmworkers.

Homeless

Homelessness is a complex issue that has become a significant social concern in recent years. The number of homeless persons has increased dramatically in the last decade for a number of reasons, including: the decrease in federal housing funds, the high cost of available housing, the increasing number of mentally ill individuals living on their own, persons with substance abuse problems, women and children fleeing family violence, and the lack of family support networks in today's fast paced society.

Contacts with local organizations involved in the distribution of food and clothing to low-income individuals indicated that on occasion they have been contacted by individuals who were looking for housing for short periods of time. Unfortunately, no formal records were maintained by these organizations regarding contacts or where individuals from Auburn were relocating.

Information available to date for homelessness in Auburn was obtained by a "point-in-time" survey conducted by Sergei Shurkin and Associates, LLC (a group with an interest in such homeless projects). The survey was conducted by University of Davis students during the last week of March 2002. The report indicates that there are approximately 127 homeless individuals in the greater Auburn area (beyond the city limits). Based on information provided in the Placer County 2002 Homeless Census Report there is presently a need for transitional housing and/or emergency shelters on a regional basis. The City recognizes there may be a future need for this type of land use and is thereby proposing to amend the Municipal Code to specify where transitional housing and emergency shelters are permitted through the City's use permit process.

Agencies Offering Public Assistance to Homeless and Other Special Needs Groups

The City of Auburn currently does not have transitional housing facilities for those who need emergency shelter; however, there are three public service organizations and agencies in the City of Auburn that offer referrals to shelter, food assistance, transportation, counseling, and/or other services for the homeless, elderly, and the mentally disabled. These organizations include the Salvation Army and the Interfaith Food Closet. Peace For Families (located in Auburn and Roseville) was identified as an agency offering assistance to Auburn residents. Senior First, Senior Link, and Placer Independent Resource Service also provide informational assistance and referral services to Placer County residents.

The Salvation Army provides a food bank, PG&E assistance and housing referral assistance. They provide a food closet for people in need of supplemental food assistance in Auburn. According to the Salvation Army, approximately 150 families per month are provided with food assistance, many of which are repeat families. They also provide PG&E vouchers to seniors and families in need. The Salvation Army also refers and transports persons needing emergency housing to Salvation Army

shelters in Sacramento. It is estimated that they receives 25 requests per month for persons needing emergency housing.

Interfaith Food Closet provides food assistance on Monday through Thursday from 10 am till 2 pm for persons in the community of Auburn. The majority of those in need that request food are families and single-mothers with children.

Peace For Families (formerly Placer Women's Center) is a non-profit organization that provides services to victims of domestic violence and/or sexual assault. Some of the services they provide include: counseling, legal services, vouchers for clothing, domestic violence drop-in groups, self-defense and prevention programs, and housing assistance. Peace For Families has a nine-bedroom shelter that can accommodate up to three persons per bedroom with a kitchen, laundry, and office space. Homeless domestic violence victims can stay in the shelter for up to 60 days with Peace For Families providing housing establishment when victims are ready to leave. According to contacts with Peace For Families the vacancy rate at the shelter fluctuates, but generally few beds are available as many of their clients are families. PEACE currently offers services through three primary locations: the Auburn Services office, the confidential emergency shelter, and the Roseville Services office. In addition to these service centers, PEACE operates two Thrift Stores; one in the Auburn Dewitt Center and one in downtown Roseville. Both stores offer vouchers to clients needing emergency clothing and household establishment assistance. It also generates needed income for our general fund.

Senior First/Senior Link is a joint informational resource and referral service organization that primarily provides seniors with information concerning programs and services in Placer County, such as Meals on Wheels, RIDES volunteers, Friendly Visitors, and health and home safety repairs. Senior First/Senior Link also provides information and referrals on a variety of topics such as legal issues, support groups, education, housing, transportation, repair and maintenance services, and governmental services. These services and programs can be provided to persons of all ages. Senior First and Senior Link can be contacted at (530) 889-3500, for further information and referrals.

Placer Independent Resource Services (PIRS) advocates for the rights of people with disabilities, educates the community about disability issues, and provides services to persons with disabilities to live independent, productive lives. Any person with a disability is eligible for our services. Services are free of charge and include the following:

- **Assistive Technology Services:** Assists persons with disabilities to receive AT information, referrals and services which will enable them to live more independently. Advocates for improved access to and funding for AT.
- **Peer Support:** Recruits and trains peer support volunteers who are then "matched" with a consumer requesting such support. Offers support groups around a variety of disability-related issues including self-advocacy, coping strategies, appropriate resources and improved self-concept. Peer support generally is provided on a cross-disability basis.
- **Personal Assistant Referral:** Maintains updated registry by recruiting and orienting individuals to works as personal assistants. Discusses funding sources, educates consumers about various employer/employee management strategies and provides consumers with a list of screened applicants upon request.

- **Benefits Counseling:** Provides information and counseling to consumers about public benefits, assists with resolving benefits problems and makes appropriate referrals regarding benefits programs.
- **Housing Assistance:** Maintains updated housing availability lists according to type of subsidy and accessibility, including low-income housing. Counsels about search strategies, appropriate interview questions, and renter's rights.
- **Independent Living Skills Training:** Provides information about independent living skills training in the areas of employment options, mobility training, financial management, personal care, self-advocacy and use of adaptive equipment.
- **Information and Referral:** Provides basic information and referral related to assistive technology, local Medi-Cal providers, support groups, and many other resources and services available to people with disabilities.
- **Individual and Systems Advocacy:** Assists personal seeking services from various agencies and advocates for changes in the community such as improved transportation and housing to better meet the needs of people with disabilities.
- **Community Outreach:** Seeks to increase disability awareness and educate about the Americans with Disabilities Act by speaking, consulting and distributing materials.

Options available to address emergency housing include:

- The City of Auburn will continue to work with the City of Roseville, Placer County and other surrounding communities to further address the homeless issues.
- The City of Auburn and the City of Auburn Police Department will refer and/or transport short-term homeless women and their children victimized by domestic violence to Peace For Families.

HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS

Housing Composition

Tables A-19 and A-20 show annual changes in the housing stock for the City of Auburn and Placer County (January 1990 through January 2002), as determined by the California Department of Finance. Table A-19 shows that in 2002 the overwhelming majority of dwelling units in Auburn (67 percent) were single-family detached homes. Seventeen percent were multi-family dwellings in structures of five or more units, 12 percent were multi-family units in structures of two to four units, 4 percent were single-family attached housing units and there were no mobile homes.

Table A-19

Housing Estimates for the City of Auburn (1990 through 2002)

Year	Housing Units							Persons Per Household
	Total Units	Single		Multiple		Mobile Homes	Occupied Units	
		Detached	Attached	2 to 4	5 Plus			
1990	4,795	2,951	180	612	1,045	7	4,601	2.3
1991	5,005	3,154	180	614	1,050	7	4,803	2.2
1992	5,120	3,269	180	614	1,050	7	4,913	2.2
1993	5,196	3,307	180	624	1,078	7	4,986	2.2
1994	5,252	3,363	180	624	1,078	7	5,039	2.2
1995	5,367	3,418	180	624	1,138	7	5,150	2.1
1996	5,480	3,471	180	624	1,198	7	5,258	2.1
1997	5,550	3,529	180	624	1,210	7	5,325	2.1
1998	5,596	3,575	180	624	1,210	7	5,369	2.1
1999	5,650	3,627	180	626	1,210	7	5,421	2.1
2000	5,457	3,646	211	655	945	0	5,302	2.3
2001	5,489	3,678	211	655	945	0	5,333	2.3
2002	5,532	3,721	211	655	945	0	5,375	2.3

Source: California Department of Finance, 1990-2003
City/County Population and Housing Estimates.

Note: Estimates from the California Department of Finance are calculated with an independent methodology and are different than what the U.S. Census reports.

By comparison, Table A-20 shows that in 2002, the composition of the housing stock in Placer County was 76 percent single-family detached homes. Multi-family dwellings in structures of five or more units totaled 11 percent, 5 percent were multi-family units in structures of two to four units, 4 percent were mobile homes, and 4 percent of the housing stock countywide was single-family attached housing.

Table A-20

Housing Estimates for Placer County (1990 through 2002)

Year	Housing Units							Persons Per Household
	Total Units	Single		Multiple		Mobile Homes	Occupied Units	
		Detached	Attached	2 to 4	5 Plus			
1990	77,879	56,647	4,835	4,538	6,917	4,942	64,101	2.6
1991	80,865	58,771	4,837	4,596	7,666	4,995	66,752	2.6
1992	83,651	60,751	4,837	4,626	8,344	5,093	69,186	2.6
1993	85,890	62,273	4,844	4,645	8,977	5,151	71,136	2.6
1994	87,767	64,020	4,857	4,649	9,038	5,203	72,773	2.6
1995	90,157	66,288	4,858	4,655	9,126	5,230	74,880	2.6

Year	Housing Units							Persons
	Total Units	Single		Multiple		Mobile Homes	Occupied Units	Per Household
		Detached	Attached	2 to 4	5 Plus			
1996	92,649	68,534	4,858	4,738	9,289	5,230	77,114	2.6
1997	95,374	71,095	4,860	4,738	9,429	5,252	79,562	2.6
1998	98,804	74,412	4,860	4,747	9,508	5,277	82,552	2.6
1999	102,344	77,170	4,860	4,751	10,276	5,287	85,866	2.6
2000	107,564	80,995	4,860	4,765	11,646	5,298	90,605	2.5
2001	111,075	84,540	4,137	5,679	12,028	4,691	96,846	2.6
2002	116,928	89,155	4,137	5,747	13,185	4,704	102,236	2.5

Source: California Department of Finance, 1990-2003
City/County Population and Housing Estimates.

Note: Estimates from the California Department of Finance are calculated with an independent methodology and are different than what the U.S. Census reports.

Housing Occupancy

Vacancy

According to the 2000 Census, of the 5,457 year-round dwelling units reported, 5,302 units (97 percent) were occupied and 155 units (2 percent) were vacant (Table A-21). Only 87 percent of the dwelling units countywide were occupied, while 13 percent were vacant. Table A-21 shows Auburn's homeownership vacancy rate was less than 1 percent and their rental vacancy rate was 2 percent while Placer County had a homeownership vacancy rate of 1 percent and a rental vacancy rate of 6 percent.

Table A-21

Housing Occupancy (2000)

	City	County	City Percent	County Percent
Occupied housing units	5,302	93,382	97%	87%
Vacant housing units	155	13,920	2%	13%
For seasonal, recreational, or occasional use	23	9,905	<1%	9%
Total housing units	5,440	107,302	100%	100%
Homeowner vacancy rate			<1%	1%
Rental vacancy rate			2%	6%

Source: 2000 Census.

Homeownership

In 1990 and 2000, homeownership among Auburn households was below that of households countywide. The homeownership rate for the City in 1990 was 54 percent, while countywide homeowners represented 71 percent of all households. By comparison, the 2000 Census reported homeownership rates increases in the City, although still below the countywide rate (73 percent). In 2000, homeowners in Auburn represented 60 percent of the occupied housing units, while renters represented 40 percent.

Table A-22 breaks down homeownership rates among the different ethnic groups as identified by the U.S. Census in 2000. Ownership rates reveal that there were more owners than renters among the different ethnic groups, except for Blacks, Native Americans, Hispanics, and the race category “other” (U.S. Census terms), who comprise approximately 8 percent of the Auburn population. As a percent of the total population, persons of Hispanic origin comprise 6 percent of the population and have an ownership rate of 42 percent. This ownership rate for persons of Hispanic origin is 19 percent below that of the ownership rate for the population as a whole (58 percent). Rental rates among the different ethnic groups are comparable to the rental rates overall for the entire population, with the exception again of Blacks, Native Americans, Hispanics, and the race category “other.”

Table A-22

Homeownership Rates (2000)

Race	Percent of Total Population	Owners	Renters	Ownership Rate	Rental Rate
Non-Hispanic White	90%	2,871	1,918	60%	40%
Black	<1%	7	15	32%	68%
Native American	1%	19	30	39%	61%
Asian/Pacific Islander	1%	42	31	58%	42%
Other	<1%	22	38	37%	63%
Two or More Races	2%	47	42	53%	47%
Hispanic Origin	6%	93	127	42%	58%
Total	5,302	3,101	2,201	58%	42%

Source: 2000 Census.

An analysis of homeownership rates by age reveals that persons age 55 to 64 have the highest ownership rates in the City (Table A-23). The majority of the age groups in Table A-23 have homeownership rates equal to or above the ownership rate for Auburn’s population as a whole (60 percent), exceptions being the very young. Persons age 15 to 24 have a 100 percent rental rate. Persons age 25 to 34 also have a low ownership rate (28 percent). This is to be expected as persons of these ages are living with their parents or just becoming established and generally do not have the means necessary to purchase their own home. On the other end of the spectrum, persons age 75 and older also have homeownership rates just slightly lower than Auburn’s population as a whole. This is evidence that persons of this age in Auburn still live in their own homes and not in elderly care facilities.

Table A-23

Homeownership Rates by Age (2000)

Age	Owners	Renters	Ownership Rate	Rental Rate
15 to 24	0	273	0%	100%
25 to 34	175	453	28%	72%
35 to 44	617	339	65%	35%
45 to 54	861	415	67%	33%
55 to 64	530	140	79%	21%
65 to 74	505	144	78%	22%
75 and over	478	372	56%	44%
Total	3,166	2,136	60%	40%

Source: 2000 Census.

Tenure

Analysis of tenure by race and Hispanic origin for 2000 reveals that the majority of homeowners and renters in Auburn are Non-Hispanic White, with minority homeowners making up approximately 7 percent of the owner occupied units and 12 percent of renter occupied units (Table A-24). This disparity of White homeowners and renters is largely a function of population distribution, as Whites comprise the largest percent of the population. By examining the owner-occupied units in Auburn, it is revealed that persons of Hispanic origin comprise 6 percent of the population and represent 3 percent of the owner-occupied units and 6 percent of the renter-occupied units.

Table A-24

Tenure by Race and Hispanic Origin¹ (2000)

Race	Auburn	Percent	Placer County	Percent
Owner Occupied Units				
Non-Hispanic White	2,939	93%	59,389	87%
Black	0	--	469	<1%
Native American	0	--	377	<1%
Asian/Pacific Islander	50	1%	1,697	2%
Others	32	1%	1,203	2%
Two or More Races	60	2%	1,515	2%
Hispanic Origin	85	3%	3,718	5%
Total	3,166	100%	68,368	100%

Race	Auburn	Percent	Placer County	Percent
Renter Occupied Units				
Non-Hispanic White	1,869	88%	19,133	76%
Black	9	<1%	211	<1%
Native American	15	<1%	259	1%
Asian/Pacific Islander	29	1%	708	3%
Others	36	2%	1,181	5%
Two or More Races	49	2%	770	3%
Hispanic Origin	129	6%	2,752	11%
Total	2,136	100%	25,014	100%

Source: 2000 Census.

¹Persons of Hispanic Origin can be of any race.

Age and Condition of Housing Stock

The age and condition of the housing stock provides additional measures of housing adequacy and availability in many communities. Although age does not always correlate with substandard housing conditions, neighborhoods with a predominance of homes more than 30 years old are more likely than newer neighborhoods to have a concentration of housing in need of deferred maintenance, updating of utilities or interior amenities, rehabilitation, or replacement. Homes with deferred maintenance usually exhibit signs of aging, such as peeling or faded paint, cracked siding, or missing or broken shingles or shakes, which suggest a need for repair or replacement of those components in the near future. Homes in need of rehabilitation require immediate repair or replacement of components in disrepair to avoid health and safety problems. Homes in need of replacement require repair or replacement of so many components that it may be more cost effective to completely reconstruct the home or demolish the home and construct a new dwelling.

Just over half of Auburn's housing stock—56 percent—is less than 30 years old (Table A-25). Only 18 percent of the City's housing was constructed since the 1990s. Based on the age of the housing stock alone, the City estimates over 25 percent of the housing units in Auburn need deferred maintenance or rehabilitation.

Table A-25

Age of Housing Units

	Auburn Number of Units	Auburn Percentage	County Number of Units	County Percentage
1969 or earlier	2,410	44%	26,840	25%
1970 to 1979	928	17%	21,955	20%
1980 to 1989	1,100	21%	23,236	22%
1990 to 1998	946	17%	28,451	27%
1999 to March 2000	56	1%	6,820	6%
Total	5,440	100%	107,302	100%

Source: 2000 Census.

Housing Conditions

The City selected a survey sample size of at least 40 percent of all structures of 1 to 4 units and 100 percent of all 5 or more unit complexes in the City. Appendix C contains summary tables of the survey, and a facsimile of the survey form and rating criteria. Appendix D contains a map of the survey areas.

Information on housing conditions was collected through a “windshield survey,” which is a drive-by assessment of exterior housing conditions. While a drive-by inspection can determine if a housing unit needs a new foundation, roof, or paint, it cannot identify substandard interior conditions, such as faulty plumbing or wiring. By assessing the condition of the exterior electrical box, a correlation between substandard interior conditions and a damaged or faulty electrical box could be made. Housing units that require exterior rehabilitation often require interior rehabilitation, as well. An exterior housing conditions survey is usually considered an acceptable measure of overall housing condition and rehabilitation need.

Data on housing conditions was entered directly onto an electronic database spreadsheet that automatically tabulated point scores. The spreadsheet was formatted to permit tabulation and cross-tabulation of data to report on housing conditions by geography, housing type, and type of repair(s) needed.

The survey rating process and methodology used is recommended by the California Department of Housing and Community Development for the selection of target areas for housing rehabilitation programs. The survey included the following components:

- Foundation
- Roof
- Siding
- Doors and windows
- Electrical system (if visible)

Table A-26 and 27 summarizes the results of the housing condition survey.

Table A-26

Housing Condition Survey Results 1-4 Units

SUMMARY TOTAL: 4 or > Units									
Categories									TOTALS
Status	Occupied 1745	For Rent 2	For Sale 27	Vacant 1	Condemned 0				1775
Age	<10 24	11-20 18	21-30 93	31-50 1167	50+ 473				1775
Housing Type	Single Family 1632	Duplex 48	Triplex 33	Quadplex 62	Modular 0	Under Construction 0	Apartment 0		1775
Number of Units									1775
Exterior Type	Aluminum 0	Masonry 41	Mixed 142	Other 0	Stucco 227	Vinyl 33	Wood 1332		1775
Foundation	Not Visible 0	Good Condition 1742	Cracked/Broken But Repairable 24	Entire Replacement 2	No Foundation 7				1775
Roofing	Not Visible 0	Good Condition 863	Broken/Cracked/Cu rled Shingles/Shakes 615	Partial Re- Roofing 108	Complete Re- Roofing 188	Roof Structure Needs Replacement 1			1775
Siding	Not Visible 0	Good Condition 954	Repainting 661	Broken\cracked in spots but reparable 151	Complete Replacement 9				1775
Windows and Doors	Not Visible 0	Good Condition 1129	Repainting 384	Broken\cracked but reparable 179	Complete replacement 83				1775
Electrical	No Repair 1755	Minor Repair 17	Replace Main 3						1775
Overall Rating	Excellent	Sound	Minor Rehabilitation	Moderate Rehabilitation	Substantial Rehabilitation	Dilapidated			TOTAL UNITS SURVEYED
	624 35%	519 29%	322 18%	295 17%	12 1%	3 0%			1775

Source: City of Auburn and Parsons September 2003.

Table A-27

Housing Condition Survey Results 5+ Units

SUMMARY TOTAL: 5+ Units									
Categories									TOTALS
Status	Occupied 1312	For Rent 0	For Sale 0	Vacant 0	Condemned 0				1312
Age	<10 60	11-20 321	21-30 297	31-50 634	50+ 0				1312
Housing Type	Single Family 0	Duplex 0	Triplex 0	Quadplex 0	Modular 0	Under Construction 0	Apartment 1312		
Number of Units									1312
Exterior Type	Aluminum 0	Masonry 5	Mixed 97	Other 0	Stucco 317	Vinyl 0	Wood 893		
Foundation	Not Visible 0	Good Condition 1312	Cracked/Broken But Repairable 0	Entire Replacement 0	No Foundation 0				1312
Roofing	Not Visible 0	Good Condition 669	Broken/Cracked/Cu rled Shingles/Shakes 546	Partial Re- Roofing 87	Complete Re- Roofing 10	Roof Structure Needs Replacement 0			1312
Siding	Not Visible 0	Good Condition 731	Repainting 544	Broken\cracked in spots but reparable 37	Complete Replacement 0				1312
Windows and Doors	Not Visible 0	Good Condition 898	Repainting 189	Broken\cracked but reparable 93	Complete replacement 132				1312
Electrical	No Repair 1312	Minor Repair 0	Replace Main 0						1312
Overall Rating	Excellent	Sound	Minor Rehabilitation	Moderate Rehabilitation	Substantial Rehabilitation	Dilapidated			TOTAL UNITS SURVEYED
	493	508	87	224	0	0			1312
	38%	39%	7%	17%	0%	0%			

Source: City of Auburn and Parsons September 2003

Properties with One to Four Units

Among properties with one to four dwelling units, 1,775 units were included in the survey. About 35 percent (629 units) needed rehabilitation and less than 1 percent (3 units) needed replacement. Most homes in need of rehabilitation required minor or moderate rehabilitation. Of the dwelling units found not in need of rehabilitation, 29 percent (519) exhibited signs of deferred maintenance which, if not properly addressed within the next several years, could result in a need for rehabilitation.

Properties with Five or More Units

Among properties with five or more dwelling units, 1,312 units were included in the survey. Of the dwelling units found not in need of rehabilitation, 39 percent (508 units) exhibited signs of deferred maintenance, which, if not properly addressed within the next several years, could result in a need for rehabilitation. About 24 percent (311 units) needed rehabilitation and zero needed replacement.

Table A-28 summarizes the results of the 2003 housing conditions survey. Appendix D provides the map of the survey area.

Table A-28

Housing Conditions Survey – Total Results

	Units Not Requiring Rehabilitation		Units Suitable for Rehabilitation		Units Unsuitable for Rehabilitation		Total Units Surveyed	% of Total Units
1-4 Units	1,143	64%	629	35%	3	<1%	1,775	40% ¹
5+ Units	1,001	76%	311	24%	0	0%	1,312	140% ²
2003 Total	2,144	69%	940	30%	3	<1%	3,087	57% ³

Source: City of Auburn and Parsons September 2003.

¹The 2000 Census states that there are 4,498 1-4 units in the City. Parsons surveyed 1,775, 40 percent of the total units.

²The 2000 Census states that there are 940 5+ units in the City. Parsons surveyed 1,312 units, this is more units than were counted in the 2000 Census. This could be a result of units being built since the census survey was conducted, some of the 5+ structures could have been counted as 1-4 units structures, or a combination of reasons.

³The 2000 Census states that there are 5,440 total units in the City. Parsons surveyed 3,087 total units, 57 percent of the total housing stock.

Overcrowding

In general, overcrowding is a measure of the ability of existing housing to adequately accommodate residents. Too many individuals living in housing with inadequate space and number of rooms can result in deterioration of the quality of life within a community. The U.S. Census defines overcrowding as more than one person per room, excluding uninhabitable space such as bathrooms, hallways, and closets. Extreme overcrowding is often defined as more than 1.5 persons per room. Overcrowding results when either: 1) the costs of available housing with a sufficient number of bedrooms for larger families exceeds the family's ability to afford such housing, or 2) unrelated individuals (such as students or low-wage single adult workers) share dwelling units due to high housing costs. This can lead to overcrowded situations if the housing unit is not large enough to accommodate all of the people effectively.

Tables A-29 and A-30 summarize the incidence of overcrowding for both the City and County. Table A-28 shows approximately 1 percent of the City's occupied housing units were overcrowded compared to 2 percent of the County's occupied housing units.

Table A-29

Persons Per Room in All Occupied Housing Units (2000)

Persons	City	Percent	County	Percent
0.50 or less	4,028	76%	65,085	70%
0.51 to 1.00	1,125	21%	24,731	26%
1.01 to 1.50	95	2%	1,976	2%
1.51 to 2.00	36	1%	972	1%
2.01 or more	20	0%	618	1%

Source: 2000 Census Data.

Table A-30 shows that in 2000, 6 percent of the renter-occupied and 1 percent of the owner-occupied units in the City were defined as overcrowded. In contrast, figures for overcrowding for the County were 9 percent renter-occupied and 1 percent owner-occupied. Comparably, there is a slightly higher rate of overcrowding in the County than in Auburn.

Table A-30**Overcrowded Housing (2000)**

Number of Persons per Room	Rental Units	Percent of Total Occupied Rental Units	Owner Units	Percent of Total Occupied Owner Units
City				
1.01 to 1.50	77	4%	18	<1%
1.51 or more	47	2%	9	<1%
Total	2,138	6%	3,166	1%
County				
1.01 to 1.50	1,092	4%	884	1%
1.51 or more	1,127	5%	463	<1%
Total	25,014	9%	68,368	1%

Source: 2000 Census Data.

Housing Costs***Rental Apartments***

Table A-31 shows apartment rental price ranges in Auburn and surrounding cities for October 2003. Searches for the City of Auburn found rental apartments in the one-, two-, and three-bedroom categories. No four-bedroom apartments were found in Auburn. The median rental price in the City of Auburn for a one-bedroom apartment was \$610, while a two-bedroom was \$700, and the three-bedrooms had a median rental price of \$850. By comparison, Rocklin and Roseville had rents in all bedroom sizes well above that of Auburn and above the 2003 fair market rents for existing housing in Placer County.

Auburn's rental prices were, on average, the lowest of the communities surveyed (Loomis being the exception) and below the range of fair market rents for existing housing in Placer County. The primary reason that rents in Auburn are affordable to very low- and low-income persons is that eight apartment complexes in the City are assisted through some type of subsidy. This equates to 472 units, or approximately 9 percent of the housing stock citywide (5,440 housing units citywide, 2000 Census). This is a substantial number of affordable units for a community the size of Auburn.

Table A-31**Rental Rates for Apartments in Auburn and Surrounding Cities (October 2003)**

City	1 Bedroom		2 Bedrooms		3 Bedrooms		4 Bedrooms	
	Price Range	Median Price	Price Range	Median Price	Price Range	Median Price	Price Range	Median Price
Auburn	\$445 – \$825	\$610	\$555 – \$1,020	\$755	\$600 – \$1,100	\$850	--	--
Loomis¹	--	--	\$545	\$545	--	--	--	--
Rocklin	\$750 – \$1,155	\$950	\$850 – \$1,270	\$1,092	\$1,095 – \$1,550	\$1,350	--	--
Roseville	\$799 – \$1,250	\$920	\$925 – \$1,320	\$1,125	\$1,050 – \$1,770	\$1,380	\$933 – \$1,575	\$1,250

Source: homestore.com, October 2003.

¹Only one property found.

Note: (--) denotes no units advertised of particular bedroom size.

The Placer County area 50th percentile fair market rents are listed between \$503 and \$1,159 for fiscal year 2003 (Table A-32).

Table A-32**2003 Fair Market Rents for Existing Housing in Placer County¹**

Studio	1 Bedroom	2 Bedrooms	3 Bedrooms	4 Bedrooms
\$651	\$733	\$918	\$1,273	\$1,501

Source: Federal Register HUD, 2003.

¹50th percentile fair market rents.**Mobile Home Parks**

Mobile home parks are permitted in any residential district with the issuance of a use permit (Chapter 4, Article 6 of the *Auburn Municipal Code*). According to the City, there are no mobile home parks within city limits. There are, however, eight mobile home parks located outside the city limits but within the 95603 Auburn area zip code.

Home Prices

Table A-33 lists prices of single-family resale homes that were for sale as of August 2003. The highest percentage of homes for sale in Auburn were three-bedroom homes (45 percent), followed by four-bedroom homes (42 percent) and two-bedrooms homes (13 percent).

According to Placer County Association of Realtors, the median selling price for a single-family home in the Auburn city limits between January 2003 and September 2003 was \$336,500 (312 units sold). Broken down into bedroom size, this reflects a median price of \$236,750 for 2 or fewer bedrooms, \$319,500 for 3 bedrooms, and \$421,950 for 4 or more bedrooms.

Table A-33**Resale Home Prices in Auburn (August 2003)**

	Bedrooms	Units for Sale	Median	Average	City Range	Percent of Total
Single-Family Homes						
	1	1	\$239,000	\$239,000	\$239,000	<1%%
	2	28	\$237,500	\$269,342	\$189,000-\$525,000	13%
	3	96	\$395,000	\$473,445	\$219,950-\$2,250,000	45%
	4	90	\$574,900	\$678,280	\$349,900-\$2,500,000	42%
Total	--	215	\$469,000	\$415,000	\$239,000-\$2,500,000	100%

Source: Placer County Board of Realtors August 2003.

New home sale prices in Auburn range from the high- \$300,000s to \$520,000 (October 2003). Table A-34 includes a sampling of three single family projects in the city, these projects are not intended to be a representation of all existing and proposed new developments in Auburn. Home sizes range from approximately 1,700 square feet to 2,410 square feet with three- to four-bedrooms and two- to three-baths. New homes in Lincoln, Rocklin, Roseville, and Loomis on average sell within the mid- to high- \$300,000s.

Table A-34**New Home Sale Prices in Auburn**

Name of Development	# of Lots	Price Range	Square Feet	Bedrooms/Bathrooms
Grayhorse ¹	50	from the high \$300,000s	1,732 – 2,410	3 to 4 bedrooms 2 to 3 baths
Ashlock ²	9 lots	\$420,000 to \$520,000	1,900 – 2,400	3 to 4 bedrooms 2 to 3 baths
Marcelais ²	8 lots	\$420,000 to \$520,000	1,900 – 2,400	3 to 4 bedrooms 2 to 3 baths

Source: Warmington Homes and Haldeman Homes, October 2003.

¹Grading began in March 2003 and model construction is scheduled to start 4th quarter 2004. Sales are anticipated to start early 2004.

² Projects are approved and under construction.

Surrounding Area Home Prices

Table A-35 is a list of median resale home prices throughout the City of Auburn and the surrounding area for August 2001 and 2002 (the data was not reported by size and number of bedrooms). The median home price in the City of Auburn was \$340,000. By comparison, the cities of Placerville, Foresthill, Lincoln, and Rocklin had median home prices ranging from \$55,000 to \$122,000 less than Auburn's, while Loomis and Newcastle had median home prices

\$100,000 greater. Data is for detached, single-family homes that closed escrow in August 2001 and 2002.

Table A-35

Median Home Prices for Auburn and Surrounding Areas (August 2001 and 2002)

Jurisdiction	Number of Homes Sold	% Change from August 2000 to 2001	Median Sale Price	% Change from August 2001 to 2002	Highest Price paid
Placerville	33	-35.3%	\$218,000	13.5%	\$452,000
Foresthill	6	-57.1%	\$249,500	-0.2%	\$390,000
Lincoln	41	-4.7%	\$268,000	22.1%	\$489,000
Rocklin	36	-12.2%	\$285,000	3.6%	\$595,000
Auburn	40	-14.9%	\$340,250	22.0%	\$615,000
Loomis	24	0.0%	\$440,000	29.2%	\$1,150,000
Newcastle	8	-27.3%	\$440,000	22.2%	\$604,000

Source: Placer County Association of Realtors Multiple Listing Service, August 2001 and 2002.

Planned or Approved Subdivisions

As of August 5, 2003, Table A-36 provides the number of lots, acreages, location, and status of residential subdivisions in the planning stages or approved by the City of Auburn. Thirty-two lots are in the planning stage and another 597 lots are approved or in varying stages of lot improvement, review, and/or construction.

Table A-36

Auburn Residential Subdivision Status Listing¹

Subdivision	Lots	Acres	Location	Status
In Planning				
Canyon Creek	24	10.9	East of Riverview Dr, South and West of Maidu Dr	Submitted 5/30/03 – awaiting re-submittal
Marcelais	8	2.1	660 Dairy Rd	Submitted 6/11/03 – awaiting re-submittal
Approved				
Ashlock (SUB 790)	10	4.4	720 Dairy Rd	Improvements under construction
Auburn Bluffs Lot E (SUB 785)	20	15.5	East of Auburn Folsom Rd, South of Sunrise Ridge Cr	11 lots under construction
Camjen Court (SUB 788)	7	2.2	Camjen Ct	Improvements completed
Canyonridge Lane (SUB 02-1)	6	7.2	143 Borland Ave	Improvement plans in review
Canyon Rim Estates (SUB 02-3)	23	120	Southern Terminus of Eagles Nest	Approved by City Council 7/14/03
Cobblestone	70	70	East of Auburn Folsom,	Improvement plans in review

Subdivision	Lots	Acres	Location	Status
(SUB 02-2)			Immediately North of City Limits	
Diamond Ridge (SUB 760)	47	26.7	South of Indian Hill Rd, West of Santa Barbara Subdivision	2 lots remaining
Grand Oaks (SUB 783)	88	32.6	North of Indian Hill Rd, West of Auburn Folsom Rd	69 lots under construction or built
Granite Bay Vista (SUB 758)	80	80	West of Auburn Folsom Rd, Immediately North of City Limits	25 lots under construction or built
Grayhorse (SUB 03-1)	50	17	Southeast Corner of Auburn Folsom Road and Maidu Dr	Approved by City Council 4/23/03 Improvement plans in review
Montecielo (SUB 751)	63	24	Riverview Drive North of Maidu Dr	± 18 lots remaining
Santa Barbara (SUB 02-4)	7	5	South of Indian Hill, East of Diamond Ridge Subdivision	Approved by Planning Commission on 7/1/03
Southridge VI (SUB 781)	48	17.7	South End of Southridge Dr	8 lots remaining
Woodland Estates (SUB 782)	34	16	West End of High St and Clark St	Improvements completed
Multi-Family				
Gooch Apartments (CD 03-13)	9	.78	195 Lincoln Way	Submitted 9/11/03
Palm Terrace Apartments (CD 00-7)	80	16.7	Northwest corner Palm and Nevada Street	Affordable units. Under constructions; first phase release in 10/03.

Source: City of Auburn, 2003.

¹Updated October 2, 2003.

Lower Income Households Overpaying

As stated previously, there are four income categories typically used for comparative purposes based on the median countywide income: very low-income (0-50 percent of median income), low-income (51-80 percent of median income), moderate-income (81-120 percent of median income) and above moderate-income (greater than 120 percent of median income). One method of analyzing housing affordability to each income group is to compare the number and/or percent of housing units by cost to the number and/or percent of households by comparable income levels.

A standard measure of housing affordability is that average housing expenses should not exceed 30 percent of a household's income. Those who pay 30 percent or more of their income on housing may experience difficulty in affording other basic necessities. However, individual circumstances that can affect the ability to afford housing vary, such as other long-term debt payments, the number of household members, and other large ongoing expenses (such as medical bills). Since it is impossible to consider each household's individual circumstances, the 30 percent rule provides a general measure of housing affordability for the average household.

Table A-37 shows the number of households paying over 30 percent of their income on housing. Of the total 5,319 households in Auburn in 2000, 1,356 (25 percent) lower income households spent over 30 percent of their income on housing. Of the total very low- and low-income households, 78 percent of the very low-income households and 40 percent of low-income households spend over 30 percent of their income on housing. Some households choose to pay over 30 percent of their income for various reasons,

such as location, aesthetics, or other factors. Other households choose to pay larger percentages of their income because they may receive tax advantages or are investing with the knowledge that their income will increase so that they pay a lower percentage of their income on a long-term basis. In contrast, very low- and low-income households are forced to pay a large percentage of their income because they cannot afford higher rents, and they are limited to certain costs due to a lack of available low-cost housing options.

Table A-37

Number of Households Paying Over 30 Percent of Income on Housing (2000)

Income	Owners		Renters		Total Households in the City
	Households	Percent	Households	Percent	
Very Low-Income	123	22%	550	81%	865
Low-Income	339	98%	344	68%	1,725
Total	462	--	894	--	2,590

Source: 2000 Census Data.

Note: Income ranges in this table (very-low income and low-income) correspond to dollar categories as reported by the 2000 Census.

Further analysis of housing expenditures as a percent of income in 2000 shows that most homeowners and renters with incomes of \$35,000 and above paid less than 30 percent of their income for housing (Table A-38). Renters with incomes below \$20,000 paid the highest percentages of income for housing.

Table A-38

Auburn Housing Expenditure Rate per Income Group (2000)

Income	<\$10,000	\$10,000-\$19,999	\$20,000-\$34,999	\$35,000-\$49,999	\$50,000+	Total Households
Renters						
Under 30%	23%	16%	48%	86%	100%	1,165
30-34%	8%	0%	18%	11%	0%	177
35%+	69%	81%	34%	3%	0%	717
Total Households	285	393	565	380	436	2,059
Owners						
Under 30%	11%	44%	61%	54%	84%	2,155
30-34%	23%	20%	7%	10%	6%	219
35%+	66%	36%	32%	36%	10%	556
Total Households	71	116	303	477	1,963	2,930

Source: 2000 Census.

Affordability Trends

Housing affordability refers to the relationship between total household income and total household expenditure for housing, including mortgage, taxes, insurance, and utilities. This relationship is typically expressed as the percentage of total household income allocated to housing expenditures. The actual percentage will vary of course from household to household reflecting individual choices regarding the allocation of income.

Notwithstanding the fact that individual households may choose to spend more or less for their housing needs, it is necessary to have some guidelines as to what a household should expect to spend on housing in relation to other expenditures. This is particularly necessary for households in lower income categories where the expenditure for housing is likely to directly affect the amount of money available for other basic needs.

For many years, the standard guideline for determining whether a housing unit was “affordable” to a prospective renter or purchaser was that the total housing cost should not exceed 25 percent of the household's gross income. In 1990, this guideline was raised to 30 percent (Health and Safety Code Section 50052.5 and 50053). This standard is applied to most federal and state housing programs; however, the use of higher ratios of income to monthly payments, as much as 40 percent, has become standard in the industry.

According to the 2000 Census, the median gross rent was \$674 in the City and \$780 in Placer County. People with very low-incomes had a variety of affordable housing options, 68 percent; of the apartment units in the City had rental rates below 30 percent of the income for a very low-income household. People with low-incomes had more options than those with very low-incomes, as there was a sufficient number of lower-cost units available to these households. Local rents were primarily within the range of affordability of households in the upper end of the low-income range (70-80 percent of median income) and moderate-income households.

Table A-39 provides an estimate of the number of affordable rental units at each income level. The percentage of apartments affordable within the very low-, low- and moderate-income groups is cumulative and includes the percentage from the previous income group. The majority of Auburn's rental apartments are assisted with subsidies and this is reflected in the percent of the City's rentals that are affordable to very-low and low-income households. However, the existence of lower-cost units does not mean that such units are actually available to lower-income households.

Table A-39

Affordability of Rental Housing in Relation to Income 2000

Income Group	Affordable Rent Limit	Percent of Auburn Rentals	Percent of County Rentals
Very Low	\$719.00	68%	52%
Low	\$1,150.00	97%	94%
Moderate	\$1,726.00	99%	99%

Source: 2000 Census.

A household can typically qualify to purchase a home that is two and one-half to three times its annual income, depending on the down payment, the level of other long-term obligations (such as a car loan), and interest rates. In practice, the interaction of these factors allows some households to qualify for homes priced at more than three times their annual income, while other households may be limited to purchasing homes no more than two times their annual income. Based on active properties and homes sold in 2000, Table A-40 shows that there were 37 homes affordable to persons within the very low-income group or one percent of all houses for sale in 2000. While 7 percent of the active properties and homes sold in 2000 were affordable to persons within the low-income group, 37 percent were affordable to persons in the moderate-income group. Homebuyer assistance programs that provide down payment assistance and/or below market-rate interest rates often allow homebuyers to qualify for houses that are up to four times their incomes.

Table A-40

Sold Units Affordable to Lower-Income Households (2000)

Income Group	Affordability Level¹	Homes For Sale in 2000²	Percent of All Houses For Sale
Very Low-Income	\$84,803	37	1%
Low-Income	\$135,684	207	7%
Moderate-Income	\$203,526	1,096	37%

Source: 2000 Census.

¹The affordability level is based on the Placer County median income of \$56,535 for 2000 Census.

²Homes for sale were taken from 2000 Census Value for Specific Owner-Occupied Housing Units.

ASSISTED HOUSING PROJECTS

In 1989, the California Government Code was amended to include a requirement that localities identify and develop a program in their housing elements for the preservation of assisted, affordable multi-family units. Subsequent amendments have clarified the scope of the analysis to include units developed pursuant to inclusionary housing and density bonus programs. In the preservation analysis, localities are required to provide an inventory of assisted, affordable units that are eligible to convert within ten years. As part of the analysis, an estimation of the cost of preserving versus replacing the units is to be included, as well as programs designed to preserve the affordable units.

Assisted Rental Housing Eligible for Conversion

Over the past several decades, hundreds of thousands of affordable rental housing units have been constructed in California with the assistance of federal, state, and local funding (loans or grants) that restricted rents and occupancy of units to lower income households for a specified period. The City of Auburn contains six such assisted rental housing developments:

- Auburn Palms
- Auburn Villa
- Auburn Ravine Terrace
- Palm Terrace
- Brookside Senior Apts.
- Valley Oaks

The inventory of assisted units includes a review of all multi-family rental units under federal, state and/or local programs, including HUD programs, state and local bond programs, redevelopment programs. The inventory also covers all units that are eligible for change to non-low-income housing

units because of termination of subsidy contract, mortgage prepayment, or expiring use restrictions. Once the period of rent/occupancy expires, a property owner may charge market rents. Low-income occupants are often displaced when rents rise to market levels. The housing element must identify any such publicly assisted rental units eligible for conversion, and include a program to address their preservation, if possible.

Table A-41 lists the eight assisted rental units in the City of Auburn, their funding sources, subsidy expiration date, and level of risk of conversion to market rate. Auburn Palms Apartment is an elderly complex consisting of 50 assisted units subsidized through Federal Housing Administration (FHA) 236 and Section 8 contracts. These units do not have long-term affordability restrictions and are currently at-risk due to the annual renewal of the Section 8 contracts by the owner. Auburn Villa Apartments is an elderly complex consisting of 49 assisted units subsidized through FHA 221(D)(4) and Section 8 contracts. These units also do not have long-term affordability restrictions and are currently at-risk of converting to market rate units due to the annual renewal of the Section 8 contracts. Auburn Ravine Terrace Apartments is a 129-unit complex consisting of 50 subsidized units for the elderly. Subsidies for the 50 units, through FHA 231 and Section 8 contracts, are renewed on an annual basis by the non-profit owner. Because Auburn Ravine Terrace is owned by a non-profit, these units are considered a low to medium risk of converting to market rate.

Brookside Senior Apartments (48 assisted units for the elderly and disabled), Palm Terrace (80 family assisted units), and Valley Oaks (59 elderly assisted units) all have long-term affordability restrictions and are considered a low risk for conversion to market rate.

Within the City of Auburn, no other assisted rental units funded through Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) monies, mortgage revenues bonds, Redevelopment Agency (RDA) funds, density bonuses, or California Housing Finance Agency (CHFA) funds were found.

The cost of conserving the assisted units is estimated to be significantly less than that required to replace the units through new construction. Conservation of assisted units generally requires subsidizing the difference between market-rate and assisted rents. Since land prices and land availability are generally the limiting factors to development of low-income housing, it is estimated that subsidizing rents to preserve assisted housing is more feasible and economical than new construction.

According to the report conducted by the City of Auburn Urban Development Agency, *Affordable Housing: A Strategy for the Future* (2000), the cost to assist affordable units from becoming market rate is between \$20,000 and \$50,000 per unit in Auburn. At this price range, it would cost the City approximately \$1.0 to \$2.5 million to assist in preserving a 50-unit complex.

Table A-41

Assisted Rental Units and Section 8 Units

Assisted Rental Units							
Project Name	Address	Type	Total Units	Assisted Units	Type of Assistance	Expiration Date	Risk Level
Auburn Palms	701 Auburn Ravine Rd.	Elderly	50-units	50-units	FHA Ins. 236 Section 8	Section 8 Expired 5/00 Currently Being Renewed on an annual basis	High – Profit Motivated Owner
Auburn Villa	628 Mikkelsen Dr.	Elderly	50-units	49-units	FHA 221(D)(4) Section 8	Section 8 Expired 8/03 Currently being renewed on an annual basis	High – Profit Motivated Owner
Auburn Ravine Terrace	750 Auburn Ravine Rd.	Elderly	129-units	50-units	FHA 231 Section 8	Section 8 Expired 12/02 Currently being renewed on an annual basis	Low to Medium – Non Profit Owner
Brookside Senior Apts.	738 Mikkelsen Dr.	Elderly Disabled	48-units	48-units	Rural Development.	N/A	Low
Palm Terrace	1040 Redhawk Lane	Family	80-units	80-units	Tax Credit Program/ Section 8	Assistance does not expire till 2040	Low
Valley Oaks	600 Auburn Ravine Rd.	Elderly	60-units	59-units	FHA 202 Section 8	Assistance does not expire until 8/2014	Low

Source: Affordable Housing: A Strategy for the Future, City of Auburn, 2000.

With regard to Section 8 projects, the property owner can opt to terminate the Section 8 contract (opt-out), renew the contract for another five years, or renew on an annual basis. The primary incentive for Section 8 property owners to opt-out is the higher rent that would be paid for these units at market value.

For the property owner to successfully opt-out of the Section 8 contract, the owner must satisfy certain procedural requirements. A Notice of Intent (NOI) must be filed with HUD one year before the termination date that indicates the owner's intent to convert the units to market rate. Failure to file an NOI within the specified timeframe, or follow the other procedures to opt-out of the Section 8 contract, results in an automatic contract rollover for five years.

Upon filing of an NOI, HUD may offer several incentives to property owners to remain in their contracts including re-financing the property mortgage, and establishing higher rents charged for the projects.

Pursuant to Section 65863.10 of the Government Code, the property owner of a Section 8 contract must also provide six months advanced notification to each tenant household if the property owner intends to terminate the Section 8 contract. The notice must indicate the anticipated date of conversion and the anticipated rent increase, the possibility of remaining subsidized, the owner's intentions, and the appropriate contacts for additional information. The property owner must also send a copy of the statement to the City or County where the property is located, to the appropriate local housing authority, and to the Department of Housing and Community Development. The statement must indicate the number, age, and income of affected tenants, the type of assistance, and the owner's plans for the project.

There are several non-profit organizations active in the Placer County region that have the managerial capacity to own and manage, and have expressed an interest in being notified of the availability of assisted rental housing. Table A-42 lists these organizations.

Table A-42

Non-Profit Housing Organizations Interested in Acquiring At-Risk Rental Housing

ACLC Inc.	42 North Sutter St., Suite 206	Stockton
Affordable Housing Foundation	P.O. Box 26516	San Francisco
Christian Church Homes of Northern CA, Inc.	303 Hegenberger Road, Suite 201	Oakland
Eskaton Properties, Inc.	5105 Manzanita Ave.	Carmichael
Mercy Housing California (Formerly Rural California Housing Corporation)	3120 Freeboard Drive, Suite 202	West Sacramento
Project Go, Inc.	3740 Rocklin Rd.	Sacramento

Source: HCD, August 2001.

FUTURE HOUSING NEEDS

State law (California Government Code Section 65584) requires that each city and county plan to accommodate a fair share of the region's housing construction needs. In urban areas, state law provides for councils of governments to prepare regional housing allocation plans that assign a share of a region's housing construction need to each city and county. In the six-county greater Sacramento region (comprising the counties of Sacramento, Placer, El Dorado, Yolo, Sutter, and Yuba), SACOG is the entity authorized to determine the future housing needs for the region. SACOG adopted a regional housing

allocation plan in September 2001, called the "Regional Housing Needs Plan" (RHNP). This plan covers a seven and one-half year period from January 1, 2000 through June 30, 2007.

Existing need is evaluated based on overpayment and overcrowding by lower-income households. The housing allocation also includes an "avoidance of impaction" adjustment to reduce the further concentration of low-income households in jurisdictions that have more than the regional average.

SACOG's methodology is based on regional population and housing forecasts developed for its transportation model. The numbers of housing units assigned in the plan to each jurisdiction are goals that are intended to address the minimum new housing construction need from anticipated population growth in the region.

The housing units allocated in the plan to each city and county are considered minimum needs. Most, if not all, jurisdictions have existing unmet housing needs (such as from overcrowding and overpayment) that should be considered during the preparation of a housing element, and which may result in housing construction objectives that exceed the regional allocation. The City must however use the numbers allocated under the RHNP to identify measures (policies and ordinances) that are consistent with these new construction goals. While the City must also show how it will provide adequate sites for construction of the required units, it is not obligated to build any of the units itself or finance their construction.

According to the RHNP, the City of Auburn has a total housing construction need of 688 units, which equates to an annual need of roughly 98 units. Table A-43 shows the City of Auburn's 2000-2007 planning period allocation, as determined by SACOG.

Table A-43

Regional Housing Needs Plan (2000 – 2007)

Dwelling Units	Percent of Total	Income Level
93	13%	Very Low-Income
122	17%	Low-Income
206	30%	Moderate-Income
267	40%	Above Moderate-Income
688	100%	Total

Sources: SACOG 2000-2007 Regional Housing Needs Plan.

FUTURE DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL

Areas with Potential for Residential Development

The City of Auburn estimates that there are approximately 280 acres of undeveloped residentially zoned land available within the City that has the potential to accommodate 961,-1,215 new units in various residential Zoning Ordinance designations (Table A-44). Appendix E contains a vacant land map and Appendix F contains a complete listing of all the vacant parcels in the City.

Historically, developers in the City of Auburn have built at densities below what the City's Zoning Ordinance allows. Calculation of the potential number of new dwelling units within each residential

district was based on the average densities of projects constructed over the past 5 years. For purposes of calculating potential future single family dwelling units on vacant land, the City assumes projects will, on average, be built out at 65 percent of the maximum permitted density allowed by the Zoning Ordinance.

Through evaluating recent affordable higher-density residential developments, it has been determined that these projects have ranged between 10.4 and 30 units per acre with an average density of approximately 14.5 units per acre.¹ The City is also proposing a minimum density in the R-2 and R-3 zones to ensure that multi-family housing will be built in these zones. Program A of the 2003-2004 Housing Element is proposing a minimum of 6 units per acres in the R-2 District and a minimum of 9 units per acre in the R-3 District.

Examples of such higher-density multi-family affordable housing projects constructed and/or approved within the R-2 and R-3 zoning districts include the following:

- | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. Volunteers of America (1993/94) | 60 senior assisted units | 30 units/acre |
| 2. Palm Terrace Apartments (2003) | 80 assisted units | 10.4 units/acre ¹ |

The following is a description of the available vacant land in the City and the number of units that could potentially be accommodated in low-, medium-, and high-density districts.

- Auburn has approximately 20 acres of land zoned for high-densities (9-15 units per acre) that could accommodate between 187 and 313 new dwelling units. This high-density zoned land is located in the City's Zoning Ordinance designation R-3. The City has been able to accommodate housing affordable to low- and very low-income households at presently zoned densities in R-3 district, even at the typically lower densities at which housing has been constructed (10.4 units per acre). High density residential is allowed as of right in the Central Business District (C-2) and Regional Commercial District (C-3). There are approximately 17 acres in the C-2 District that could accommodate an additional 156 to 261 multi-family units and 21 acres in the C-3 District that could accommodate an additional 193-322 multi-family units. High density residential is allowed in the Neighborhood Commercial (C-1) districts with a use permit. There are 19 acres in these zones that could accommodate an additional 171 to 285 units.
- Auburn has approximately 61 acres of land zoned for medium-densities (0-10 units per acre) that could accommodate between 140-188 new dwelling units. This medium-density zoned land is located in the City's Zoning Ordinance designation R-2 (allows between 6-10 units per acre), R1-5, R1-7, and R1-8.5.
- Auburn has approximately 199 acres of land zoned for low-densities (0-4 units per acre) that could accommodate up to 457 new dwelling units. These low-density zoned lands are located in the City's Zoning Ordinance designations R1-10, R1-15, and R1-20.

Vacant land zoned for low- and medium-densities can accommodate between 597-645 new dwelling units. These potential new units are sufficient to accommodate the City's regional allocation of 473 units for moderate- and above moderate-income households.

Vacant land zoned for high-density can accommodate between 187 and 313 new dwelling units at densities potentially affordable to low- or very low-income households. Vacant land in the C-2 and C-3

¹Note: 80 units were constructed at lower densities than average due to environmental site constraints that significantly reduced the total number of developable acres.

district can accommodate an additional 349 to 583 units. The City's regional allocation for very low- and low-income households is 215 dwelling units.

Table A-44

City of Auburn Vacant Land Summary

City of Auburn Zoning Ordinance Designation	Maximum Permitted Density by Zoning Ordinance	Number of Sites	Total Acres	Potential New Units ¹
R1-20	1 unit per 20,000 square feet	10	22 acres	31
R1-15	1 unit per 15,000 square feet	34	32 acres	69
R1-10	1 unit per 10,000 square feet	97	145 acres	357
R1-8.5	1 unit per 8,500 square feet	5	8 acres	28
R1-7	1 unit per 7,000 square feet	56	30 acres	102
R1-5	1 unit per 5,000 square feet	2	1 acres	3
R-2	6-10 units per acre ²	6	5 acres	32-53
R-3	9-15 units per acre ²	37	20 acres	187-313
C-2	Allows R-3 as of right 9-15 units per acre	28	17 acres	156-261
C-3	Allows R-3 as of right 9-15 units per acre ³	24	21 acres	193-322
Total		299	301	1,158-1,539*
Estimated Total Potential New Residential Units				

Source: Parsons and City of Auburn, October 2003.

¹The potential number of new units is based on a combination of historical densities of projects developed in Auburn over the last 5 years and an assumption that future projects will be built out at 65 percent of the maximum permitted density in the low density residential zone.

²The potential number of new units in the R-2 and R-3 districts are based on a minimum density in the R-2 of 6 units per acre and 9 units per acre in the R-3 district.

³Currently the City's land use density is 5-15 units per acre in the C-3 district. The City is proposing to increase the minimum density in the C-3 district to 9 units per acre.

Available Public Facilities and Services, Infrastructure

Since most of the vacant land in the City consists of infill sites water, sewer, and other necessary public facilities and services are available. The City charges appropriate development impact fees to ensure water lines, sewer lines, roads and other necessary infrastructure to serve new residential development can be extended in a timely manner.

There are no major transportation or road improvements that constrain development. Where off-site problems do occur, the City will require a traffic study, intersection analysis or other appropriate study to be completed prior to the issuance of building permits. Individual traffic or access problems can only be determined at the time of site plan review.

Densities

Currently, the City of Auburn allows a maximum of 15 units per acre in their high density residential district. To further insure that 15 units per acre is a sufficient density to accommodate an affordable housing project the City of Auburn's Housing Element consultant conducted phone interviews with local for-profit and non-profit developers.

The basis for the interviews was to determine what density is sufficient to build an affordable, multi-family housing project. The summaries provide generic information on affordable densities based on these three people's personal experiences. Special consideration was not taken for Auburn's rural character and topography.

Phone interview #1, Representative from Mercy Housing, Sacramento

The representative from Mercy Housing had a positive response to a maximum density of 15 units per acre for an affordable housing project within the City of Auburn. When it comes to applications for funding, 20 units an acre is considered "favorable" but this is only one of the many factors in the application process. Other factors include close proximity to public transit, shopping centers, and medical facilities.

The City's development standards play a big part in determining if 15 units per acre can be affordable. If the City is willing to provide density bonuses and flexibility in development standards including parking requirements and open space requirements then 15 units per acres for an affordable housing project can be achieved.

Phone interview #2, Private Developer in the Auburn area

Another discussion took place with a private developer who assisted in the Palm Terrace Project and is currently in the initial phases of working on two other affordable projects in the Auburn area. Based on this person's experience in the Auburn area, a density of 15 units per acres is an affordable density for a lower-income multi-family housing project. In this person's opinion, the most pressing issue with developing affordable housing projects is securing enough funding for the project.

Phone interview #3, Representative from USA Properties, Sacramento

Lastly, another non-profit developer who is currently working on an affordable housing project in unincorporated Placer County and it is currently being tied up with the County's development standards and fees was interviewed. Although this person prefers the minimum density for an

affordable housing project to be within 18-22 units an acre, projects can still be affordable at lower densities. There are many more factors that come into play in the development of an affordable housing project including the local jurisdiction's development standards and fees.

Based on the responses from all three developers a maximum density of 15 units per acre in the high density residential district would be able to accommodate an affordable multi-family housing project with the following conditions:

- Availability of funding. The City will assist in funding, when funding is available, and/or assist the developer in the application process for funding.
- Flexibility in the City's development standards and their willingness to work with the developer. The City will work closely with the developer on parking requirements, setbacks, and all other development standards to ensure the projects affordability.
- Density bonuses. Based on previously constructed affordable housing projects, the City is willing to award density bonuses to ensure the projects affordability.

CONSTRAINTS

The Government Code, as it relates to the Housing Element, requires an analysis of both governmental and non-governmental constraints to the development of affordable housing. Auburn has identified various constraints to housing production in an effort to address as many barriers as possible. Removal of these constraints must be balanced with other health, safety, and welfare concerns.

NON-GOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS

Land Costs

Land prices in Auburn are generally higher than similar properties in Placer County. However, as Placer County and the Auburn area develops and provides more employment opportunities, it is anticipated that the price of raw land will become more comparable to the price structure of the region. Table A-45 shows vacant land for sale in the City of Auburn (October 2003). Depending upon the size and location of the parcel involved, in general, listed vacant single-family residential land range from \$70,000 to \$700,000 per acre. Those listed parcels that are less than one acre average \$237,000 per lot. Listed parcels that are more than one acre average \$195,000 per lot. By comparison, vacant land zoned single-family in surrounding communities (i.e., Loomis, Newcastle, Penryn, and Rocklin) range from \$95,000 to \$325,000 per acre, again depending on size and location of the parcel.

Table A-45

Single-Family Vacant Land – For Sale in Auburn (October 2003)

Lot Size	Location	Price	Price/Acre
6.2 acres	Incline Drive	\$435,000	\$70,161
1.75 acres	Highway 49	\$185,000	\$105,714
1.0 acres	Ridgeview Circle	\$139,000	\$139,000
0.85 acres	Ridgeview Circle	\$155,000	\$182,352
0.44 acres	Ridgeview Circle	\$229,000	\$520,454
0.66 acres	Auburn Ravine Road	\$369,900	\$435,176
0.27 acres	Vista Del Lago	\$195,000	\$722,222

Source: Lyon Real Estate Auburn, www.lyonbps.katabat.com,
October 2003.

Construction and Labor Costs

Many factors can affect the cost of building a house, including the type of construction, materials, site conditions, finishing details, amenities, and structural configuration.

An internet source of construction cost data (www.building-cost.net), provided by Craftsman Book Company, estimates the per square foot cost of a single-story home in the Auburn area, including construction materials and labor, ranges from \$95 to \$100 per square foot, depending on the size of the home and the number of stories (one or two). Excluding land costs, the Craftsman Book Company calculator estimates that a small three-bedroom tract house of 1,800 square feet would have a minimum cost of approximately \$182,000 (including direct job costs, permits and utilities, plans and specs, and

contractor markup). Based on the information above and including land costs, the minimum cost to produce an 1,800 square foot tract home in Auburn would cost approximately \$400,000.

The cost of raw land is \$10,000 to \$769,000 a unit. The cost variation is impacted by lot sizes, primary infrastructure needed for the area, and improvements to collector streets including landscaping, sound walls, and additional lanes. Based on these assumptions, the cost of a single-family tract home in Auburn, ranging from 1,300 to 3,000 square feet, would vary from \$250,000 to \$1,000,000 with total permitting costs between 8 to 12 percent of the total value of the home.

Given the cost range listed above for a market rate single-family home in Auburn, none of the very low- or low- income households in the City could afford to own a home in the City without some assistance from a subsidy or first-time homebuyer program. Of the moderate-income households in the City of Auburn, only households earning in the upper end of the moderate income range could afford to own a home, assuming again that no other subsidies or first-time homebuyer assistance programs are utilized.

The Cost and Availability of Financing

According to the City, there are no local constraints to the availability or cost of financing for home purchases or rehabilitation. Even in the City's older neighborhoods, there are no barriers to obtaining financing for home purchase, improvement, or construction (other than customary underwriting considerations by lenders).

Financing for housing development is generally outside the influence of local government. Lending institutions operating in Placer County maintain branches in Auburn, but as with all other mortgage finance organizations, the interest rates they offer follow market conditions. In times of high interest rates, financing problems have been viewed as a major factor in housing constraints. The lack of financing at reasonable rates eliminates major segments of the population from securing housing.

The primary factor related to home finance affecting housing affordability and availability is the cost of borrowing money (interest rates). Historically, substantial changes in interest rates have correlated with swings in home sales. When interest rates decline, sales increase. The reverse has been true when interest rates increase. Over the past two decades, there has been a dramatic growth in alternative mortgage products, such as graduated mortgages and variable rate mortgages. These types of loans allow homeowners to take advantage of lower initial interest rates and qualify for larger home loans. Even during periods of high interest rates, these alternative products allow more buyers to qualify for homeownership, thus minimizing the swings in home sales that accompany changes in interest rates.

Nevertheless, the fixed interest rate mortgage remains the preferred type of loan, especially during periods of low, stable interest rates. Most governmental programs that seek to increase homeownership among low- and moderate-income households rely on loan products that provide fixed interest rates below prevailing market rates, either for the principal loan or for a second loan that provides part of the down payment for home purchase. Many programs offer deferred second loans to facilitate homeownership. Table A-46 shows interest rates for 15- and 30-year fixed loans in the Auburn area. Interest rates change on a daily basis. On October 8, 2003 the interest rate for a 15-year fixed loan based on an average loan amount of \$230,000 was 4.875, while the interest rate for a 30-year fixed was 5.625. However, according to Auburn Home Loans, homebuyers have purchased with interest rates as low as 1.25.

Table A-46

Interest Rates for 15- and 30- Year Fixed Loans¹

15-Year Fixed Loan		30-Year Fixed Loan	
Interest Rate ²	Points	Interest Rate ²	Points
4.875	0	5.625	0

Source: Auburn Home Loans.

¹Based on an average loan amount of \$230,000.

²Rates for October 8, 2003. Rates are subject to change on a daily basis.

Environmental Constraints

Most of the vacant parcels that are scattered throughout the City are surrounded by existing development and could be classified as infill. However; due to the topography of the City, vacant land could possibly have constraints that might include limited access, wetlands, native trees, and geologic constraints.

The City has historically been able to deal with these constraints and still provide affordable housing. For example, Palm Terrace includes 80 units built on 16.7 acres of which 9 of these acres is dedicated to open space due to the topography of the site and the preservations of the valley oak trees on the site.

GOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS

Governmental constraints include land use controls, building codes and their enforcement, site improvements, fees, exactions required of developers, and local processing and permit procedures. Land use controls may limit the amount or density of development, while building codes may set specific building standards that add material costs or limit building space on a site, thus increasing the cost of housing per unit.

Land Use Controls

The General Plan and Zoning Ordinance regulate land use in Auburn. All residential land use classifications pose a constraint to residential development in the sense that various conditions, building requirements, and limitations restrict a pure free market ability to construct housing. Land use regulations also have the potential of adding costs to construction, which indirectly may constrain housing. These impacts are measured against the general health and public safety served in adopting such regulations. Standards have been determined by the City to establish minimum constraints in order to provide for adequate separation of buildings for fire protection, air and light between structures, and the intensity of development. Implementation of these standards has not resulted in a serious constraint in providing housing to the various income levels.

Table A-47 (page A-53) provides a summary of Auburn's residential zoning regulations, including building setback, height, and parking requirements for single-family and multi-family residential districts. The following is a description of the residential districts in the City and the allowable densities.

1. *Single-family Residential District (R-1)*. Designates areas for single-family homes. Density ranges from zero to four units per acre.

2. *Two-Family Residential (Duplex) District (R-2)*. Designates areas for more intense residential uses. Appropriate land uses include higher density single-family homes such as duplexes. Density ranges from zero to 10 units per acre.
3. *Medium Density Multiple-Family Residential District (R-3)*. Designates areas for intense multi-family residential land uses. Density ranges from five to 15 units per acre.

Planned Unit Development

The Planned Unit Development (PUD) (*Auburn Zoning Ordinance*, Chapter 4, Article 7) is intended to encourage innovations in residential development and renewal so that the growing demands for housing may be met by greater variety in the type, design, and layout of dwellings and by the conservation and more efficient use of open space. The following uses are permitted in a PUD:

- any land uses permitted in the basic combining district classification,
- single-family dwellings,
- two-family dwellings,
- multiple (3 or more) family dwellings,
- recreation uses,
- buildings and accessory uses, and
- highway service, commercial, manufacturing, and airport.

The combination of uses should be compatible with the intent of the General Plan of the City and result in a balanced and stable environment.

The construction of a PUD requires the issuance of a use permit by the Planning Commission, with any appeals brought to the City Council for review. Lot size requirement for a PUD are not less than one acre, unless the applicant can prove a hardship exists on a less than one-acre lot that still lends itself to the construction of a PUD. Such hardships include topographic constraints, preservation of natural features, or the construction or rehabilitation of existing housing for very low-, low-, and moderate-income persons. Standards for parking, open space, and building coverage are as follows. These standards are used only as a guide and are not meant to be mandatory.

Land Use Intensity (Dwelling Units/Acre)	Off-Street Parking (Spaces/Dwelling)	Percent Set-Aside for Open Space	Maximum Building Coverage
3	2	70%	16%
4	2	65%	18%
5	2	60%	20%
6	2	55%	22%
7	2	50%	24%
8	2	45%	26%
9	2	40%	28%
10 and over	2	35%	30%

The City of Auburn encourages and facilitates the use of PUD's through the following incentives:

- density bonus,
- reduced site plan standards,
- variation in parking requirements, and
- use of clustering to increase density and reduce development costs.

Planned Development combining districts encourage residential development at the upper end of the allowed density range within the applicable districts by allowing developers to vary from the stricter application of the development standards of the base zoning districts. This flexibility provides for, and can promote cluster housing, zero lot lines, townhomes, and similar housing types that can be more difficult to develop with typical setbacks and lot coverage.

Permitted Uses in Residential Zoning Districts

The Auburn Municipal Code designates permitted, non-permitted, and conditional uses for all developable use types in the City in relation to the City's zoning categories (Table A-48).

- Single-family dwellings are permitted in all residential districts. Due to the fact that single-family residential units are allowed in the R-2 and R-3 districts the City is planning to amend the zoning ordinance to require a minimum density of 6 units per acre in the R-2 district and 9 units per acre in the R-3 district to preserve the limited supply of multi-family zoned land for multi-family uses.
- Duplexes and multi-family dwellings are permitted in the R-2 and R-3 districts, but they are not permitted in the R-1 District. Apartments and rental housing units are allowed through a use permit process in the Commercial (C-1) District, and are permitted by right in the Central Business (C-2) District and the Regional Commercial (C-3) District.
- Second residential units are permitted by conditional use in all districts where single-family dwellings are a permitted use (R-1, R-2, R-3 districts).
- Residential care providers up to 6 are permitted in all residential districts.
- Dwelling groups (i.e. residential care facilities of 7 or more persons) and boardinghouses are permitted by conditional use in the R-1, R-2, and R-3 district. The review process for group homes of 7 or more currently requires approval of a Use Permit. Use Permits are reviewed and acted on by the Planning Commission. Typical processing time for a Use Permit is 12-16 weeks, though if there are no significant issues associated with the home, the time frame could be reduced to 8-12 weeks. No extra processing time is required and no extra processing fee (other than standard Use Permit fees) would be required. In addition City provides (without an application fee) an application for reduction or waiver of fees that is approved through the City Council.
- Mobile Home parks are allowed through a conditional use permit in the R-1, R-2, and R-3 Districts.
- Transitional housing (housing for drug/social rehab or parole-related care facilities of 6 or less) is permitted by conditional use in the R-1, R-2, and R-3 district.
- The City's Municipal Code does not currently specify where emergency shelters and transitional housing are permitted. The need for emergency shelters and transitional housing has been identified on a region wide basis. In response to this regional need, the City is proposing to amend its Zoning Code to add a separate use category and definition for emergency shelters and

transitional housing and designate the zones in which emergency shelters and transitional housing will be permitted with a use permit (Program K). The City will select zoning district(s) in which there are existing vacant or underutilized sites that could accommodate transitional housing. Appropriate locations for transitional housing are required to be considered during a public hearing process before any commitments can be made regarding suitable sites.

The City is proposing an amendment to Chapter 4 (Zoning) of the Municipal Code that would allow emergency shelters through a conditional use permit process in the Central Business(C-2) District and Regional Commercial (C-3) district. Conditional use requirements are described in Article 13 of the Auburn Municipal Code. Emergency shelters will not be subject to additional conditions. Transitional Housing will be permitted in the high density residential zoning district (R-3)

Table A-47

City of Auburn Residential Zoning Requirements with Allowable Residential Development

	R-1 Single-family Residential	R-2 Two-Family Residential (Duplex)	R-3 Medium Density Multiple- Family Residential
Minimum Lot Size (sq. ft.)	5,000	5,000	5,000
Maximum Density (sq. ft./unit)	5,000	3,500	2,750
Maximum Density (dwelling unit/acre)	0 – 4	0 – 10	5 – 15
Minimum Front Yard Setback	20 ft.	20 ft.	20 ft.
Minimum Side Yard Setback: 1 Story Side	5 ft.	5 ft.	5 ft.
Minimum Side Yard Setback: 2 Story Side	7.5 ft.	7.5 ft.	7.5 ft.
Minimum Side Yard Setback: Street Side	12.5 ft.	12.5 ft.	10 ft.
Minimum Rear Yard Setback	25 ft.	10 ft. ¹	10 ft. ¹
Minimum Lot Width	50 ft.	50 ft.	50 ft.
Height Limit (Dwellings)	30 ft.	30 ft.	30 ft.
Maximum Lot Coverage	35 %	40 %	40 %
Parking Requirements	2 per unit	2 per unit	2 per unit

Source: City of Auburn Municipal Code, 1996.

¹Except when abutting any R-1 zoned property a 6 ft. high wall or fence shall be built along the rear property line and a 5 ft. wide landscape buffer shall be provided adjacent to the wall or fence.

Table A-48

Residential Permitted, Non-Permitted, and Conditional Use Requirements

Use Type	R-1	R-2	R-3
Single-Family Dwellings	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted
Duplex (Two-Family Dwelling)	Not Permitted	Permitted	Permitted
Multi-family Dwelling, 3+	Not Permitted	Not Permitted	Permitted
Second Residential Units	Conditional Use Permit	Conditional Use Permit	Conditional Use Permit
Mobile Home Parks	Conditional Use Permit ¹	Conditional Use Permit ¹	Conditional Use Permit ¹
Permanent Manufactured Homes	Permitted	Not Permitted	Not Permitted
Emergency Shelter	Not Permitted	Not Permitted	Not Permitted
Transitional Housing	Conditional Use Permit (for drug/social rehab or parole-related care facilities of 6 or less)	Conditional Use Permit (for drug/social rehab or parole-related care facilities of 6 or less)	Conditional Use Permit (for drug/social rehab or parole-related care facilities of 6 or less)
Residential Care Providers, up to 6	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted
Residential Care Providers, 7 or more	Not Permitted	Not Permitted	Not Permitted
Drug and/or Social Rehabilitation, up to 6	Conditional Use Permit	Conditional Use Permit	Conditional Use Permit
Senior Housing Developments	Not permitted, unless homes for the ambulatory aged are considered, then permitted	Not permitted, unless homes for the ambulatory aged are considered, then permitted	Not permitted, unless homes for the ambulatory aged are considered, then permitted
Rest Homes and Outpatient Nursing Care Homes, up to 15	Up to 6 Permitted 7-15 Conditional Use Permit	Up to 6 Permitted 7-15 Conditional Use Permit	Permitted
Rooming Houses, up to 15	Conditional Use Permit ²	Conditional Use Permit	Conditional Use Permit
Rooming Houses, 16 or more	Not Permitted	Not Permitted	Not Permitted

Use Type	R-1	R-2	R-3
Homes for the Ambulatory Aged, Mentally Impaired, Congregate Living Health Care, or Developmentally Disabled Persons, up to 6	Permitted	Permitted	Conditional Use Permit
Caretaker and Employee Housing	Not Permitted	Not Permitted	Not Permitted
Farm Labor Housing	Not Permitted	Not Permitted	Not Permitted
Small Family Day Care	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted
Large Family Day Care	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted

Source: City of Auburn Municipal Code, 1996.

¹Subject to a use permit, a mobile home park is permitted in any residential district when the mobile home park meets the provisions of the Auburn Municipal Code, Chapter 4, Article 6 and any conditions which might be imposed by the Planning Commission.

²On lots not less than one acre in size.

Building Codes

Building Codes regulate the physical construction of dwellings and include plumbing, electrical, and mechanical divisions. The purpose of the Building Code and its enforcement is to protect the public from unsafe conditions associated with construction. The City of Auburn enforces the State Building Code standards (Title 24) for existing units, new construction, and residential rehabilitation. Housing related complaints are dealt with on a case-by-case basis with the Building Department (i.e. the building inspector) being involved if the nature of the complaint involves building code issues.

State law affords local government some flexibility when adopting the uniform codes. The building codes can be amended based on geographical, topological or climatological considerations. Further, State Housing law provides that local building departments can authorize the use of materials and construction methods other than those specified in the uniform code if the proposed design is found to be satisfactory and the materials or methods are at least equivalent to that prescribed by the building codes. A review of the City's amendments to the uniform codes (Chapter 15.04 of the Auburn Municipal Code) indicates that the amendments do not have a substantial impact on the cost of residential development. Auburn's amendments to the State Building Code standards primarily concern a minimum 20-lb snow load required for roofs and "contributory areas" and weight loads on rafters. Areas less than 600 square feet which normally get reductions per the State Building Code due to application of contributory areas do not get this reduction in the City of Auburn.

Code Enforcement

The City of Auburn Code Enforcement Officer works with the Police Department, Fire Department, Building Department, and Community Development Department to investigate reported violations of laws relating to nuisances and zoning, which typically includes illegal home occupations, illegal second units, dangerous structures, fence violations, illegal signs, graffiti, debris, and weeds, as well as inoperable and illegal vehicles. The code enforcement process is typically initiated in the following three ways: (1) observation by city staff; (2) as a consequence of an action (i.e., an application for a building permit or a request for a zoning variance); or (3) in response to a complaint by an individual. The City relies on residents to help identify the majority of the code violations.

Development Fees

The financing of public facilities and services for new development in Auburn, as in most California jurisdictions, is funded in part by exactions and fees levied against development projects in proportion to the anticipated fiscal impact on the community. In all instances, the fees are determined based on a proportional share of cost necessary to fund capital improvements. In this sense, they are fixed overhead costs that cannot be reduced by policy. Although these fees are necessary to meet City standards, they can have substantial impact on the cost of housing, particularly affordable housing. Auburn charges a number of permit and development impact fees to cover the cost of processing development requests and providing public facilities and services to new developments. In creating a development fee structure, Auburn carefully balanced the need to offset the cost of public services with a level of fees that do not inhibit residential development. See Appendix G for a complete fee schedule.

Permit Processing Procedures

Applications for residential subdivisions are processed within a 3 to 5 month period; however, applications that are more complex may take up to 12 months because of project pre-planning, site constraints and environmental review. Processing time is largely determined by the availability of staff time as well as the number and/or significance of project related issues. The City of Auburn meets state-

required timelines for the approval of development permits (Table A-49). The time required for development approval is not generally a constraint or substantial cost to housing developers.

Table A-49

Application Processing Times

Application Type	Estimated Approval Time Period
a. Single-Family Project	±4 weeks ¹
b. Multi-family Project	Design review: 3-4 months
c. Variances	± 2 months
d. Residential Design Review (Single- and Multi-family projects)	SFR – not required MFR – see (b) above
e. Projects with Environmental Review	Factored Into Estimated Approval Times
f. Rezone	3-6 months
g. General Plan Amendment	3-6 months
h. Lot Line Adjustment	2-3 months
i. Parcel Map	3-4 months
j. Subdivision Map (Project)	3-5 months
k. Conditional Use Permit	3-4 months

Source: City of Auburn, 2003.

¹SFR projects only require a building permit, separate entitlement approval is not required.

Conditional Use Permit Process

Chapter 4, Article 13 of the Auburn Municipal Code regulates the issuance of use permits. Applications are reviewed by the Planning Commission, which has the authority to approve, conditionally approve, or disapprove the application. The Planning Commission meets on the first and third Tuesdays of each month. Processing time for a Conditional Use Permit varies from 2 to 4 months depending on project complexity, adjacent issues, and whether additional environmental review is needed. Application fees for Conditional Use Permits range from \$415 - \$1,443. The focus of the CUP typically relates to neighborhood compatibility (i.e. architectural design, setbacks, parking, orientation, etc.). In the event that an applicant or any other interested party is not satisfied with the Planning Commission's actions of a use permit, an action can be appealed and brought to the City Council for review.

Following a public hearing, a use permit is subject to findings by the Planning Commission, such as:

- The proposed use is substantially similar in characteristic to a use or uses currently within the district;
- The proposed use would be appropriate in the district applicable to the property as a permitted or conditional use; and

- The proposed use would not be detrimental to the health, safety, peace and morals, comfort and general welfare of the community.

The Conditional Use Permit process addresses impacts of the use, not the user. This process does not act as a constraint to the development of affordable housing because:

- It does not add significant time or delay to the approval of projects;
- The Planning Commission does not impose additional development standards through the Conditional Use Permit, but addresses the findings that are described in Chapter 4, Article 13 of the Municipal Code; and
- The City's Conditional Use Permit application packet provides clear direction on the process and standards for review.

If it is determined that a developer would need a Conditional Use Permit to proceed with City approvals, it is the City's policy to provide as much information as possible. The City's website (www.ci.Auburn.ca.us) is a resource where project applicants can go to obtain further information and City contact phone numbers.

Housing for Persons with Disabilities

As noted in the Special Needs section of the this Housing Needs Assessment Report, persons with disabilities have a number a housing needs related to accessibility of dwelling units, access to transportation, employment, and commercial services, and alternative living arrangements that include on-site or nearby supportive living services.

The City ensures that new housing developments comply with California building standards (Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations) and federal Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements for accessibility. Sites zoned for Medium and High Density Residential uses and Commercial zones that allow for mixed-uses are located along arterial streets and transportation corridors to facilitate access and accessibility for persons with disabilities.

Procedures for Ensuring Reasonable Accommodations

The City of Auburn has established procedures to ensure that reasonable accommodations are made for persons with disabilities. In conjunction with plancheck review, individuals with disabilities can request special accommodation or variance from building codes due to a disability. The City has a Handicap Appeals Board that can review such requests for multi-family residential housing, through no such requests have been made to-date. The City also insures equal facilitation during the planning process as part of design review. For example, a recent apartment project was required to provide fixtures for ground-floor units that would accommodate persons with disabilities or that could easily convert.

Efforts to Remove Regulatory Constraints for Persons with Disabilities

The State of California has removed any City discretion for review of small group home projects (six or fewer residents). The City does not impose additional zoning, building code, or permitting procedures other than those allowed by state law. There are no City-initiated constraints on housing for persons with disabilities caused or controlled by the City.

The City also allows residential retrofitting to increase the suitability of homes for persons with disabilities in compliance with ADA requirements. Such retrofitting is permitted under Chapter

11 of the 1997 Uniform Building Code. The City works with applicants who need special accommodations in their homes to ensure that application of building code requirements does not create a constraint. The City's Zoning Ordinance has been reviewed for Chapter 11 compliance and determined to be compliant.

Information Regarding Accommodation for Zoning, Permit Processing, and Building Codes

The City implements and enforces Title 24 of the 2001 California Code, which is very similar to ADA. The City provides information to applicants or those inquiring of City regulations regarding accommodations in zoning, permit processes, and application of building codes for persons with disabilities.

Zoning and Other Land Use Regulations

As part of the update of the City Housing Element in 2003-2004, the City of Auburn conducted a comprehensive review of its zoning laws, policies and practices for compliance with fair housing law. The City has not identified zoning or other land use regulatory practices that could discriminate against persons with disabilities and impede the availability of such housing for these individuals.

Examples of the ways in which the City facilitates housing for persons with disabilities through its regulatory and permitting processes are:

- The City allows some variation from the application of its parking standards. For example, the reduction of parking spaces for a unique use such as a senior housing project can be approved by processing a variance.
- Similarly, Section 9-4.9005. Facilities: Minimum Dimensions provides the Community Development Department with the authority to establish and approve parking stalls and maneuvering areas other than those set in the ordinance. An example would be a reduction in the width of a drive aisle when associated with vehicle overhang into a landscape area.
- All of the City's commercial zones also allow group homes. The City has no authority to approve or deny group homes of six or fewer, except for compliance with building code requirement, which are also governed by the State of California.
- The City does not restrict occupancy of unrelated individuals in group homes.
- The City permits housing for special needs groups, including for individuals with disabilities, without regard to distances between such uses or the number of uses in any part of the City. The Land Use Element of the General Plan does not restrict the siting of special needs housing.

Permits and Processing

The City does not impose special permit procedures or requirements that could impede the retrofitting of homes for accessibility. The City's requirements for building permits and inspections are the same as for other residential projects and are fairly simple and straightforward. City officials are not aware of any instances in which an applicant experienced delays or rejection of a retrofitting proposal for accessibility to persons with disabilities.

As discussed above, the City allows group homes of six or fewer persons by right, as required by state law. No conditional use permit or other special permitting requirements apply to such homes.

The City does not impose special occupancy permit requirements for the establishment or retrofit of structures for residential use by persons with disabilities. If structural improvements were required for an existing group home, a building permit would be required. If a new structure were proposed for a group home use, Design Review would be required as for any other new residential structure. To the City's knowledge, its Design Review process has not been used to deny or substantially modify a housing project for persons with disabilities to the point where it is no longer feasible.

Design review is not required for single-family residential development. All multi-family residential projects in Auburn require design review by the Planning Commission. The design review process typically takes three to four months. The hearing process for group homes and special needs housing for persons with disabilities is the same as for other residential projects.

Building Codes

The City provides reasonable accommodation for persons with disabilities in the enforcement of building codes and the issuance of building permits through its flexible approaches to retrofitting or converting existing buildings and construction of new buildings that meet the shelter needs of persons with disabilities. The City of Auburn adopted and implements the 1997 Uniform Building Code (UBC) and California Code, which is mandated by the State. The only additions to the uniform code that the City has adopted are:

- No reductions are permitted under Table 16c for slope and area or structural members of tributary loading under 600 square feet.

Universal Design Element

The City has not adopted a universal design ordinance governing construction or modification of homes using design principles that allow individuals to remain in those homes as their physical needs and capabilities change. Program M of the 2003-2004 Housing Element is a program for the City to evaluate the feasibility of a universal design ordinance. A bill pending before the Legislature, AB 2787, would require the Housing and Community Development Department (HCD) to develop guidelines and a model ordinance consistent with the principles of universal design. Rather than attempt to "reinvent the wheel," Auburn will consider a model ordinance prepared by the State of California before adopting its own ordinance.

Conclusion

In light of current and proposed planning policies and zoning regulations, the City believes that it has mitigated any potential constraints to the availability of housing for persons with disabilities.

Second Residential Unit Requirements

A second residential unit is a second living unit located on an existing residential lot often referred to as "granny" or "mother-in-law" units. The purpose of an accessory dwelling unit is to provide a small, self-contained living unit that can be used by a family member or as a rental unit. An accessory dwelling unit can be proposed for construction on any lot that is zoned for residential use (R-1, R-2, and R-3) if there is an existing single-family dwelling. The City's current second residential unit ordinance (Chapter 4,

Article 23) is not consistent with newly adopted State legislation (July 1, 2003, Government Code Section 65852.2). The City is in the process of reviewing an administrative draft to amend the Municipal Code to permit second units, by right, in all residential districts, subject to administrative staff review for conformance with applicable zoning standards. Amendments to the City's Municipal Code will be finalized and adopted by December 31, 2004.

Manufactured Homes and Mobile Home Park Standards

Manufactured homes are permitted on a permanent foundation in the Single Family Residential (R-1) district. Manufactured homes located outside a mobile home park must conform to all residential use development standards for the R-1 zoning district.

According to the Auburn Zoning Ordinance, a manufactured home should conform to the following criteria.

1. Conforms to all requirements for single-family structures in the R-1 district.
2. Certified under the National Home Construction and Safety Act of 1974.
3. Size is at least 1,200 square feet.
4. Meets the standards of Title 24, California Energy Commission requirements.
5. Roof pitch is a minimum of 3.5 to 12, exterior siding is wood, floor joists are eighteen inches from finished grade, and eave overhang is a minimum of twelve inches.
6. Occupancy is limited to single-family residential use only.

Mobile home parks are permitted subject to a use permit in any residential district when the mobile home park meets the provisions of Chapter 4, Article 6, Sections 9-4.604 and 9-4.605 in the City's Municipal Code and any additional provisions that the Planning Commission may impose as part of the use permit process.

Parking Requirements

The Auburn Municipal Code, Chapter 4, Article 9, Section 9-4.903 describes the parking requirements for residential uses in the City. A permit is required for the establishment of any off-street parking area other than for single- or two-family dwellings (Section 9-4.902). Single-family (R-1) and multiple-family (R-2 and R-3) dwelling units require two off-street parking spaces per dwelling unit. The off-street parking space required for any lot in which a single- or multi-family dwelling is built may not be provided in the required front or street side yard area (Section 9-4.907). Rooming houses require one parking space for every two guest rooms or four beds for guests, whichever requires the greater number of parking spaces. Nursing and convalescent homes require one parking space for every two patient beds. Parking requirements in the City are not considered excessive or a constraint on residential development.

Design Review

Article 8 (Design Control) of the Auburn Municipal Code describes the process for design review in the City. Design review ensures that new development will be consistent with the City's General Plan policies for the proper protection, enhancement, and use of places, sites, buildings, and structures. The City's Municipal Code is very explicit as to the guidelines and procedures that must be followed during

the design review process. This clarity of language gives the applicant certainty that if the guidelines and procedures in the Municipal Code are followed correctly, a successful design review process will be the outcome.

The City is currently reviewing Auburn's design review process, with specific focus on historic areas. To protect Auburn's stock of historic and architecturally significant structures in the Old Town and Downtown historic areas, the City is reviewing a draft Historic Preservation Ordinance. The draft ordinance specifies those structures that are subject to Historic Design Review. This includes multi-family structures within the Historic Design Review District, as well as single-family residential structures that have been voluntarily designated a historic resource by the property owner. The Historic Design Review Commission is the reviewing authority for Historic Design Review Permits. This Commission includes the Planning Commission members and four at-large members (one architect, one member of the historical society, one real property owner from the Downtown Historic District, and one real property owner from the Old Town Historic District).

The City's Municipal Code and Design Review application packet are very explicit as to the guidelines, procedures, and filing deadlines that must be followed throughout the Design Review process. The City's Design Review process does not act as a constraint to the overall supply and affordability of housing in Auburn because:

- Design Review does not add significant time or delay to project approval;
- Design Review does not add to, or modify development standards in Article 8 of the Municipal Code or standards in the applicable General Development Plan; and
- Design Review criteria are explicit and understandable.

The City does not take an excessive amount of time in processing Design Review applications, nor do they require costly building materials. The City also encourages Design Review to be conducted concurrently with other processing procedures to expedite the development permit process even further. The City believes that sufficient Design Review principles are in place to process and facilitate the full spectrum of affordable, moderate, and higher income housing.

Some projects located in the Historic Design Review District do not require a Historic Design Review Permit and instead can be reviewed administratively by the Community Development Director (i.e., minor modifications to existing site improvements, exterior painting, replacement of building materials, sidewalk replacements, landscaping, temporary signage for special events, and projects delegated by the Planning Commission).

If the applicant or any other interested party is not satisfied with the action of the Planning Commission or the Historic Design Review Commission, an action to appeal can be filed to be brought before the City Council. A Design Review Permit takes 12 to 16 weeks; administrative design review takes 1 to 4 weeks, while Historic Design Review takes 12 to 16 weeks. Applicants are strongly encouraged by the City to meet with members of the Public Works and Fire departments during the pre-application process to identify pertinent issues.

Pre-development Review

In order to facilitate the design review process, the City of Auburn offers applicants the opportunity for preliminary design review through submittal of a Pre-development application. The Pre-development application is not a prerequisite for formal submittal of an application, but

is provided to facilitate City comments on a development request prior to preparation of detailed plans for formal design review. The City's pre-development review focuses on identifying basic design issues, appropriateness and intensity of intended development, and unique project-related conditions likely to affect development. Any comments generated for pre-development review are intended to supersede more detailed comments generated during the normal design review process. The time frame for completing pre-development review is typically two to four weeks, depending on the nature of the request. Written comments are provided as part of pre-development review and are generally valid for 180 days, except where modifications to ordinances or adopted policies may occur."

ENERGY CONSERVATION OPPORTUNITIES

The opportunities for energy conservation stem primarily from the fact that most of the future residential development will occur on land that is not constrained by existing roads and infrastructure. Energy conservation can be achieved, therefore, through site development planning to reduce the need for vehicular trips by:

- providing pedestrian access to commercial and recreational facilities;
- providing mixed use development;
- providing for higher densities that would make public transit economically feasible; and
- requiring landscaping to control solar gain in buildings and on pavement, channel wind, and provide comfortable micro climates that limit dependence on artificial heating and cooling systems.

Energy conservation features are incorporated into the design of residential structures in the City of Auburn due to the requirements of Title 24. These measures include low flow plumbing fixtures, efficient heating and cooling opportunities, dual pane windows, and adequate insulation and weather stripping. Incorporating new technology within residential developments offers developers a chance to design projects that allow for maximum energy conservation opportunities.

GENERAL DESIGN STANDARDS

There are many opportunities for conserving energy in new and existing homes. New buildings, by design, can easily incorporate energy efficient techniques into the construction. According to the Department of Energy, the concept of energy efficiency in buildings is the building envelope, which is everything that separates the interior of the building from the outdoor environment: the doors, windows, walls, foundation, roof, and insulation. All the components of the building envelope need to work together to keep a building warm in the winter and cool in the summer.

Constructing new homes with energy-conserving features, in addition to retrofitting existing structures, will result in a reduction in monthly utility costs. There are many ways to determine how energy efficient an existing building is and, if needed, what improvements can be made. Examples of energy conservation opportunities include installation of insulation and/or storm windows and doors, use of natural gas instead of electricity, installation or retrofitting of more efficient appliances and mechanical or solar energy systems, and building design and orientation which incorporates energy conservation considerations.

Many modern building design methods are used to reduce residential energy consumption and are based on proven techniques. These methods can be categorized in three ways:

1. Building design that keeps natural heat in during the winter and keeps natural heat out during the summer. Such design reduces air conditioning and heating demands. Proven building techniques in this category include:
 - location of windows and openings in relation to the path of the sun to minimize solar gain in the summer and maximize solar gain in the winter;

- use of “thermal mass,” earthen materials such as stone, brick, concrete, and tiles that absorb heat during the day and release heat at night;
 - use of window coverings, insulation, and other materials to reduce heat exchange between the interior of a home and the exterior;
 - location of openings and the use of ventilating devices that take advantage of natural air flow (particularly cool evening breezes);
 - use of eaves and overhangs that block direct solar gain through window openings during the summer but allow solar gain during the winter; and
 - zone heating and cooling systems, which reduce heating and cooling in the unused areas of a home.
2. Building orientation that uses natural forces to maintain a comfortable interior temperature. Examples include:
- north-south orientation of the long axis of a dwelling;
 - minimizing the southern and western exposure of exterior surfaces; and
 - location of dwellings to take advantage of natural air circulation and evening breezes.
3. Use of landscaping features to moderate interior temperatures. Such techniques include:
- use of deciduous shade trees and other plants to protect the home;
 - use of natural or artificial flowing water; and
 - use of trees and hedges as windbreaks.

In addition to natural techniques, a number of modern methods of energy conservation have been developed or advanced during the present century. These include:

- use of solar energy to heat water;
- use of radiant barriers on roofs to keep attics cool;
- use of solar panels and other devices to generate electricity;
- high efficiency coating on windows to repel summer heat and trap winter warmth;
- weather-stripping and other insulation to reduce heat gain and loss;
- use of natural gas for dryers, stovetops and ranges;
- use of energy efficient home appliances; and
- use of low-flow showerheads and faucet aerators to reduce hot water use.

Natural space heating can be substantially increased through the proper location of windows and thermal mass. Use of solar panels can generate 1,000 watts of electricity on a sunny day. This can constitute more than enough power for daily residential operations.